arXiv:1207.6568v1 [math.PR] 27 Jul 2012

An increment type set-indexed Markov property

Paul Balança[*]

e-mail: paul.balanca@ecp.fr
url: www.mas.ecp.fr/recherche/equipes/modelisation_probabiliste

École Centrale Paris and INRIA Regularity team
Laboratoire MAS, ECP
Grande Voie des Vignes - 92295 Châtenay-Malabry, France

Abstract: In this article is introduced and studied a set-indexed Markov property named $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov*. This new definition fulfils one important expectation for a Markov property: there exists a natural set-indexed generalization of the concept of transition operator which leads to characterization and construction theorems for $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov* processes. Several other usual Markovian notions, including *Feller* and *strong Markov* properties, can also be developed in this framework. Actually, the $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov* property turns out to be a natural extension of the two-parameter $*$*-Markov* property to the multiparameter and as well the set-indexed settings. Moreover, generalizing a classic result of the real-parameter Markov theory, sample paths of multiparameter $\mathcal{C}$*-Feller* processes are proved to be almost surely right-continuous. Concepts and results introduced in this study are illustrated with various examples.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60G10, 60G15, 60G60, 60J25.
Keywords and phrases: Markov property, multiparameter processes, transition system, set-indexed processes.

1. Introduction

The Markov property is a central concept in the classic theory of real-parameter stochastic processes. Paul Lévy was the first to investigate its extension to processes indexed by a collection which is not totally ordered. Hence, he introduced in [30] the *sharp Markov* property for two-parameter processes . A process $(X_t)_{t\in[0,1]^2}$ is said to be *sharp Markov* with respect to a set $A \subset [0,1]^2$ if the σ-fields $\mathcal{F}_A$ and $\mathcal{F}_{A^c}$ are conditionally independent given $\mathcal{F}_{\partial A}$, where for any $V \subset [0,1]^2$, $\mathcal{F}_V := \sigma(\{X_t; t \in V\})$. Russo [39] proved that processes with independent increments are *sharp Markov* with respect to any finite unions of rectangles. Furthermore, Dalang and Walsh [11, 12] characterized entirely the collection of sets for which all processes with independent increments are sharp Markov.

Since the Brownian sheet was known not to satisfy this property with respect to simple sets (e.g. triangle with vertices $(0,0)$, $(0,1)$ and $(1,0)$), a weaker Markov property named *germ-Markov* has been introduced in [34]. Similarly to the sharp Markov property, a process is said to be *germ-Markov* with respect to a set $A \subset [0,1]^2$ if $\mathcal{F}_A$ and $\mathcal{F}_{A^c}$ are conditionally independent given $\mathcal{G}_{\partial A} := \cap_V \mathcal{F}_V$, where the intersection is taken over all open sets V containing ∂A. As proved in [39], the Brownian sheet is *germ-Markov* with respect to any open set.

A third Markov property, called $*$-*Markov*, arises in the two-parameter literature. It has been first defined by Cairoli [8], and then widely studied in [36, 28, 33]. In particular, this last paper has established that $*$-*Markov* processes satisfy both *sharp* and *germ-Markov* properties with respect to finite unions of rectangles and convex domains respectively. Moreover, as stated in [35, 32, 46], the concept $*$-*transition function* can be naturally introduced and leads to a complete characterization of the finite-dimensional distributions of $\mathbf{R}^2$-indexed processes. For sake of readability, the precise definition of $*$-Markov processes is only given in the core of the article.

---

[*] This article is part of the PhD thesis prepared by the author under the supervision of Erick Herbin.

This overview of the two-parameter Markov literature is clearly not exhaustive and a more complete picture is given in the sequel, including in particular the modern multiparameter approach presented by Khoshnevisan [26].

Recently, Ivanoff and Merzbach [24] introduced a set-indexed formalism that allows to define and study a wider class of processes indexed by sets. Based on this framework, several extensions of classic real-parameter processes have been investigated, including Lévy processes [20], martingales [24] and fractional Brownian motion [18, 19]. The study of the Markovian aspects of set-indexed processes led to the definition of *sharp Markov* and *Markov* properties in [25], and the *set-Markov* property in [5]. The first paper mainly focuses on the adaptation of Paul Lévy's ideas to the set-indexed formalism. The last approach, also called $\mathcal{Q}$-*Markov*, introduces a stronger property that allows to define a transition system which characterizes the law of a *set-Markov* process. More precisely, Theorem 1 in [5] states that, given an initial distribution, if a transition system satisfies a Chapman-Kolmogorov equation (2.10) and a supplementary invariance assumption (2.11), a corresponding *set-Markov* process can be constructed.

In the present work, we suggest a different approach for the introduction of a set-indexed Markov property, called $\mathcal{C}$-*Markov*. The main goal is to obtain a natural definition of the transition probabilities which then lead to satisfactory characterization and construction theorems. As presented in the sequel, this new set-indexed Markov property also appear to be a natural extension of some existing multiparameter Markov properties.

In order to introduce the definition of $\mathcal{C}$-*Markov* processes, let first recall the notations used in the set-indexed formalism. We consider set-indexed processes $X = \{X_A; A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is an indexing collection composed of compact subsets of a locally compact metric space $\mathcal{T}$, and which is assumed to satisfy the following conditions:

(i) $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under arbitrary intersections and $A^\circ \neq A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \neq \mathcal{T}$;
(ii) $\emptyset' := \bigcap_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A$ is a nonempty set (it plays a role equivalent to 0 in $\mathbf{R}_+^N$);
(iii) there is an increasing sequence $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ of sets in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{T} = \cup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} B_n$;
(iv) *Shape hypothesis*: for any $A, A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $A \subseteq A_i$.

For sake of readability, we restrict properties of $\mathcal{A}$ to those required for the development of the $\mathcal{C}$-*Markov* approach. Supplementary assumptions such as *separability from above* will be added in the sequel when necessary. In addition, the complete definition of an indexing collection can be found in [24]. Finally, we remind that the set-indexed formalism embraces the multiparameter setting through the indexing collection $\mathcal{A} = \{[0,t]\,;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$.

The notations $\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $\mathcal{C}$ respectively refer to the class of finite unions of sets from $\mathcal{A}$ and the collection of increments $C = A \setminus B$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}(u)$. According to [24] and since the assumption *Shape* holds on $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a unique *extremal representation* $\{A_i\}_{1\leq i\leq k}$ of any $B \in \mathcal{A}(u)$, i.e. such that $B = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$ and for all $i \neq j$, $A_i \nsubseteq A_j$. Therefore, in the sequel, to any increment $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is associated the unique $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$ such that $C = A \setminus B$,

$B \subseteq A$ and $\{A_i\}_{i\leq k}$ is the extremal representation of B.

Then, for any $C = A \setminus B$, $B = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$, let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}$ denotes the following subset of $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C} = \{U \in \mathcal{A}_\ell;\, U \nsubseteq B^\circ\} := \{U_C^1, \cdots, U_C^p\}, \qquad \text{where } p = |\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}| \tag{1.1}$$

and $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ corresponds to the semilattice $\{A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_k, \ldots, A_1 \cap A_2, A_1 \ldots, A_k\} \subset \mathcal{A}$. The notation $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}$ refers to a random vector $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}} = \bigl(X_{U_C^1}, \ldots, X_{U_C^p}\bigr)$. Similarly, $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is used to denote a vector of variables $(x_{U_C^1}, \ldots, x_{U_C^p})$.

Lastly, for any set-indexed filtration $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_A; A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, collections $(\mathcal{F}_B)_{B\in\mathcal{A}(u)}$ and $(\mathcal{G}_C^*)_{C\in\mathcal{C}}$ are respectively defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_B := \bigvee_{A\in\mathcal{A}, A\subseteq B} \mathcal{F}_A \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{G}_C^* := \bigvee_{B\in\mathcal{A}(u), B\cap C=\emptyset} \mathcal{F}_B. \tag{1.2}$$

The family $(\mathcal{G}_C^*)_{C\in\mathcal{C}}$ is usually called the *strong history*.

We can now introduce the set-indexed Markov property, named $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov* property, which is studied in the present work.

Definition 1.1 (**$\mathcal{C}$-Markov property**). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space. An E-valued set-indexed process X is said to be $\mathcal{C}$-*Markov *with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ if it is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ and if it satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_C^* \,] = \mathbb{E}[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \,] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-}a.s. \tag{1.3}$$

for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and any bounded measurable function $f : E \to \mathbf{R}$.

$\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes are first studied in the general set-indexed framework (Section 2). We introduce the concept of $\mathcal{C}$*-transition system*, usually denoted $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A); C \in \mathcal{C}\}$, associated to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property. It extends in a natural way the classic definition of transition operators for one-parameter processes, and in particular, the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation which becomes

$$\forall C \in \mathcal{C},\ A' \in \mathcal{A}; \qquad P_C f = P_{C'} P_{C''} f \quad \text{where} \ \ C' = C \cap A',\ C'' = C \setminus A' \tag{1.4}$$

and f is a bounded measurable function. This notion appears to be well-suited to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property. Indeed, our main result (Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 in Section 2.1) states that on one hand, the initial law of $X_{\emptyset'}$ and the transition probabilities naturally induced by a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process form a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system which characterizes entirely the finite-dimensional distributions. Moreover on the other hand, given an initial measure ν and $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$, we observe that a corresponding $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process can be constructed on the canonical space.

As stated in Section 2.2, the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property has connections with the set-indexed Markovian literature, especially the work of Ivanoff and Merzbach [25]. Nevertheless, we also notice that it clearly differs from the $\mathcal{Q}$*-Markov* approach of Balan and Ivanoff [5].

$\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes appear to satisfy several interesting properties (Sections 2.3 and 2.4). Theorem 2.3 proves that the natural filtration of $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process verifies a *conditional independence* property. Moreover, classic *simple* and *strong Markov* properties can be extended to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov formalism (Theorems 2.4 and 2.6) under an homogeneity assumption on the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system, and for the latter, the introduction of the notion of $\mathcal{C}$-Feller process. To illustrate these different concepts, several examples are given in Section 2.5, including an insight of set-indexed Lévy processes and the construction of a set-indexed $\mathcal{S}\alpha\mathcal{S}$ Ornstein-Uhlenbeck.

In a second time (Section 3), we focus on specific properties satisfied by $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes in the multiparameter setting. Thereby, Theorem 3.1 first proves that multiparameter $\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes have a right-continuous modification which is $\mathcal{C}$-Markov with respect to the augmented filtration. We observe that the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov approach can be seen as a generalization and simplification of the two-parameter $*$-Markov property. Moreover, we also note it embraces the recent multiparameter Markov developments presented by Khoshnevisan [26]. Finally, the end of the section is devoted to the illustration of the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property with multiparameter processes which often appear in the literature.

2. Set-indexed $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property

We begin this section with a few observations and remarks. In this paper are considered E-valued set-indexed processes $X = \{X_A; A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where (E, d_E) is locally compact separable metric space endowed with Borel sigma-algebra $\mathcal{E}$.

Since the assumption *shape* holds on the indexing collection, for any $\mathcal{A}$-indexed process X, there exists an extension ΔX of X on $\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $\mathcal{C}$, given by an inclusion-exclusion formula,

$$\Delta X_B := \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_{A_i} - \sum_{i<j} X_{A_i \cap A_j} + \cdots + (-1)^{k+1} X_{A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta X_C := X_A - \Delta X_B.$$

In the sequel, it will be assumed that when this extension ΔX is used, $(E, \mathcal{E}) = (\mathbf{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d))$.

According to Lemma 3.4 in [25] and using notations previously introduced, the extension ΔX on $\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies

$$\Delta X_B = \sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} X_{U_C^i} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta X_C = X_A - \left[\sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} X_{U_C^i} \right], \tag{2.1}$$

where $(-1)^{\varepsilon_i}$ corresponds the sign in front of $X_{U_C^i}$ in the inclusion-exclusion formula. In other words, equation (2.1) states that every term X_V in the inclusion-exclusion formula and such that $V \notin \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}$ is cancelled by another element in the sum.

As a consequence, we notice that equivalently to Definition 1.1, an $\mathbf{R}^d$-valued set-indexed process X is $\mathcal{C}$-Markov with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ if for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and for any measurable function $f : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\, f(\Delta X_C) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_C^* \,] = \mathbb{E}[\, f(\Delta X_C) \,|\, \mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \,] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Indeed, according to equation (2.1), ΔX_B is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{G}_C^*$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}})$, and therefore, the equality $X_A = \Delta X_C + \Delta X_B$ and classic properties of the conditional expectation induce the equivalence of definitions.

Finally, the natural filtration of a set-indexed process X is defined by $\mathcal{F}_A = \sigma(\{X_V; V \subseteq A, V \in \mathcal{A}\})$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Filtrations are always supposed to be complete. According to Definition 1.1, we observe that any $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process is always $\mathcal{C}$-Markov with respect to its natural filtration.

2.1. $\mathcal{C}$-transition system: characterization and construction results

In the light of Definition 1.1 of $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes, the concept of $\mathcal{C}$-*transition system* can be naturally introduced.

Definition 2.1 (**$\mathcal{C}$-transition system**). *A collection $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A);\, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is called a* $\mathcal{C}$-transition system *if it satisfies the following properties:*

1. *for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A)$ is transition probability, i.e. for all $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}|}$, $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\,\cdot\,)$ is a probability measure on $(E,\mathcal{E})$ and for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, $P_C(\,\cdot\,;\Gamma)$ is a measurable function;*
2. *for any $x \in E$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, $P_\emptyset(x;\Gamma) = \delta_x(\Gamma)$;*
3. *for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}$, let $C' = C \cap A'$ and $C'' = C \setminus A'$ be in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{P}$ must satisfy the following Chapman-Kolmogorov equation,*
$$P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma) = \int_E P_{C'}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'})\, P_{C''}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}};\Gamma), \tag{2.2}$$
for all $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}|}$, $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}|}$, $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}|}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$.

Let us make a few remarks on Definition 2.1.

Remark 2.2. Let $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}$. We observe that if $A' \subseteq B$ or $A \subseteq A'$, we respectively have $C' = \emptyset$ or $C'' = \emptyset$, and therefore, equation (2.2) is straight forward since one of the term is a Dirac distribution.

On the other hand, if $A' \nsubseteq B$ and $A' \subset A$, equation (2.2) is still consistent. Indeed, since $C'' = A \setminus (A' \cup B)$, and $A' \nsubseteq B$, we have $A' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}$, and therefore, the variable $x_{A'}$ is one of the component of the vector $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}$.

We also note that equation (2.2) implicitly induces that the integral does not depend on any variable x_V with $V \notin \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}$, since these components do not appear in the left-term.

Remark 2.3. In the particular case of $\mathcal{T} = \mathbf{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{[0,t]\,;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+\}$, Definition 2.1 corresponds to the usual definition of a transition system. Indeed, in this particular case, $\mathcal{A}(u) = \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{(s,t]\,;\, s,t \in \mathbf{R}_+^2\}$, and thus, $\mathcal{P}$ is indexed by $\mathbf{R}_+^2$: $\mathcal{P} = \{P_{s,t}(x;\mathrm{d}y);\,(s,t) \in \mathbf{R}_+^2\}$. Then, Definition 2.1 corresponds to:

1. for any $s,t \in \mathbf{R}_+^2$, $P_{s,t}(x;\mathrm{d}y)$ is transition probability;
2. for any $s \in \mathbf{R}_+$, $P_{s,s}(x,\mathrm{d}y) = \delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$;
3. for any $s < s' < t \in \mathbf{R}_+$, $x \in E$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies $P_{s,t}(x;\Gamma) = \int_E P_{s,s'}(x;\mathrm{d}y)\; P_{s',t}(y;\Gamma)$, since using previous notations, $C = (s,t]$, $C' = (s',t]$ and $C'' = (s,s']$.

Proposition 2.4 proves that Definition 2.1 of a $\mathcal{C}$-transition systems is coherent with the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}},\mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X be a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$. For all $C = A\setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$, the collection $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\mathrm{d}y);\, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is defined by*
$$\forall \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}|}, \Gamma \in \mathcal{E}; \quad P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma) := \mathbb{P}(X_A \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}} = \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}).$$
Then, $\mathcal{P}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system.

Proof. Let us verify the three different points from Definition 2.1.

1. Clearly, for any $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$, $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A)$ is a transition probability.
2. The equality $P_\emptyset(x; \mathrm{d}y) = \delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$ holds since, $\mathcal{G}^*_\emptyset = \vee_{V\in\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{F}_V$ and therefore, for any f bounded measurable function and all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_\emptyset\,] = f(X_A)$.
3. For any $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A' \subseteq A$ and $A' \nsubseteq B$, let $C' = C \cap A' = A' \setminus (A' \cap B)$ and $C'' = C \setminus A' = A \setminus (A' \cup B)$. Then, since $C'' \subset C$, we note that $\mathcal{G}^*_C \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{C''}$ and thus, for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, we obtain

$$P_C(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) = \mathbb{P}(X_A \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C) = \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{P}(X_A \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{C''}) \bigm| \mathcal{G}^*_C\big) = \mathbb{E}[P_{C''}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}; \Gamma) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C]. \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, for any positive measurable function h, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_{A'}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C] = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[h(X_{A'}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{C'}] \bigm| \mathcal{G}^*_C\big] = \int_{\mathbf{R}} P_{C'}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'})\, h(x_{A'}), \quad (2.4)$$

since $\mathcal{G}^*_C \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{C'}$ and the vector $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}$ is $\mathcal{G}^*_C$-measurable $(A' \cap B \subset B)$.
As $C'' = A \setminus (A' \cup B)$, we observe that $X_{A'}$ is the only term in the vector $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}$ which is not $\mathcal{G}^*_C$-measurable. Therefore, using a monotone class argument, equations (2.3) and (2.4) lead to expected equality.

□

The next two theorems gather the main result of this section: for any $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process, its initial distribution and $\mathcal{C}$-transition system characterize entirely the law of the process. Conversely, from any probability measure and any $\mathcal{C}$-transition system, a corresponding canonical $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process can be constructed. To our knowledge, such a result does not exist for other set-indexed Markov properties, or at least require some tricky technical assumption in the case of $\mathcal{Q}$-Markov.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X be a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$.*

Then, the initial distribution ν of $X_{\emptyset'}$ and the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A);\, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ characterize entirely the law of the process X.

Proof. We have to express the finite-dimensional distributions of X in terms of ν and $\mathcal{P}$.

Let $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f : E^k \to \mathbf{R}_+$ be a measurable function. Without any loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathcal{A}_\ell = \{A_0 = \emptyset', A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ is a finite semilattice with consistent numbering, i.e. stable under intersection and such that $A_j \subseteq A_i$ implies $j \le i$.

Let $C_1, \dots, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ be the left-neighbourhoods $C_i = A_i \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{j-1} A_j)$, with $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Since $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ is semilattice, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{C_i}} \subset \mathcal{A}_\ell$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Then, if we consider the law of $(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k})] &= \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{C_k}\,]\big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_E P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) f(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_{k-1}}, x_{A_k})\Big],\end{aligned}$$

using a monotone class argument and the $\mathcal{G}^*_{C_k}$-measurability of the vector $(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_{k-1}})$.

Therefore, by induction, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[f(X_{A_1},\dots,X_{A_k})]\\
&\quad= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{E^k} P_{C_1}(X_{\emptyset'};\mathrm{d}x_{A_1})\,P_{C_2}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_2}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_2})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_k})\,f(x_{A_1},\dots,x_{A_k})\Big]\\
&\quad= \int_{E^{k+1}} \nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)P_{C_1}(x_0;\mathrm{d}x_{A_1})\,P_{C_2}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_2}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_2})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_k})\,f(x_{A_1},\dots,x_{A_k}),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C_1}} = \{\emptyset'\}$. ☐

To obtain the construction theorem, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let consider a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\mathrm{d}x_A);\, C\in\mathcal{C}\}$ and two semilattices $\mathcal{A}^1 = \{A^1_0 = \emptyset', A^1_1,\dots,A^1_{n_1}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}^2 = \{A^2_0 = \emptyset', A^2_1,\dots,A^2_{n_2}\}$ with a consistent numbering and such that $\mathcal{A}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}^2 \subset \mathcal{A}$.*

Let $C^1_1,\dots,C^1_{n_1}\in\mathcal{C}$ and $C^2_1,\dots,C^2_{n_2}\in\mathcal{C}$ be respectively the left-neighbourhoods of $\mathcal{A}^1$ and $\mathcal{A}^2$, i.e. $C^1_i = A^1_i\setminus(\cup_{j=0}^{i-1}A^1_j)$ and $C^2_i = A^2_i\setminus(\cup_{j=0}^{i-1}A^2_j)$. Then, for all $x\in E$ and any positive measurable function $f : E^{n_1}\mapsto\mathbf{R}_+$, $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{E^{n_1}} P_{C^1_1}(x;\mathrm{d}x_{A^1_1})\,P_{C^1_2}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^1_2}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^1_2})\cdots P_{C^1_{n_1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^1_{n_1}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^1_{n_1}})\,f(x_{A^1_1},\dots,x_{A^1_{n_1}})\\
&\quad= \int_{E^{n_2}} P_{C^2_1}(x;\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_1})\,P_{C^2_2}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_2}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_2})\cdots P_{C^2_{n_2}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{n_2}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_{n_2}})\,f(x_{A^1_1},\dots,x_{A^1_{n_1}}).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.5}$$

We note that since $\mathcal{A}^1\subseteq\mathcal{A}^2$, every variable $x_{A^1_i}$ has a corresponding term $x_{A^2_{j_i}}$ where $j_i\in\{1,\dots,n_2\}$, which ensures the consistency of the second term of formula 2.5.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n_2. Let $k\le n_2$ be the highest index such that $A^2_k\in\mathcal{A}^2$ and $A^2_k\notin\mathcal{A}^1$. We denote $\mathcal{A}^{2\prime} = \mathcal{A}^2\setminus\{A^2_k\}$. We observe that $\mathcal{A}^{2\prime}$ is semilattice, since in the contrary, we would have $A^2_k\in\mathcal{A}^1$. Let now distinguish two different cases.

1. We first suppose that for all $i\in\{k+1,\dots,n_2\}$, $A^2_k\notin\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_i}}$. Then, we know that for any $i\in\{1,\dots,n_2\}\setminus\{k\}$, the term $x_{A^2_k}$ does not appear in the component $P_{C_i}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_i}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_i})$. Therefore, we can integrate the variable over $x_{A^2_k}$, and since $\int_E P_{C^2_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_k}) = 1$, we obtain a formula which corresponds to the case of the semilattice $\mathcal{A}^{2\prime}$.
2. We now assume there exist $i_m > \cdots > i_1 > k$ such that $A^2_k\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{i_j}}}$ for each $j\in\{1,\dots,m\}$. Let first suppose that $m\ge 2$.
   Then, there exists $i_0\in\{1,\dots,i_1\}$ such that $A^2_{i_0} = A^2_{i_1}\cap A^2_{i_2}$. As $A^2_k\subseteq A^2_{i_1}\cap A^2_{i_2}$, we have $k\le i_0$. Furthermore, $A^2_{i_0} = A^2_k$ is not possible since $A^2_{i_1}, A^2_{i_2}$, and thus $A^2_{i_0}$ belong to $\mathcal{A}^1$. Thereby, we necessarily have $A^2_k\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{i_0}}}$, which implies $i_0 = i_1$ because of i_1 definition.
   Therefore $A^2_{i_1}\subset A^2_{i_2}$. But, since $A^2_k\subset A^2_{i_1}$, we have

   $$C^2_{i_2} := A^2_{i_2}\setminus(\cup_{j=0}^{i_2-1}A^2_j) = A^2_{i_2}\setminus(\cup_{j=0,j\neq k}^{i_2-1}A^2_j).$$

   Furthermore, we notice that $\{A^2_1,\dots,A^2_{i_2-1}\}\setminus\{A^2_k\}$ is a semilattice (unless we would have $A^2_k\in\mathcal{A}^1$), and is thus stable under intersections. Hence, according to the previous

observations, we obtain $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{C^2_{i_2}}} \subseteq \{A^2_j\,;\, 0 \leq j < i_2 \text{ and } j \neq k\}$, which is in contradiction with the assumption $A^2_k \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{C^2_{i_2}}}$.
Thereby, we necessarily have $m = 1$ and without any loss of generality, we can suppose that $i_1 = k+1$. The variable $x_{A^2_k}$ only appears in the vector $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{k+1}}}$ and we only have to consider the sub-integral $\int_E P_{C^2_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A^2_k})\, P_{C^2_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{k+1}}}; \Gamma)$, for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$.
Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be $C = A^2_{k+1} \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{k-1} A^2_j)$. We observe that $C^2_k = C \cap A^2_k$ and $C^2_{k+1} = C \setminus A^2_k$. Therefore, we can apply the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation (2.2) and get

$$P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) = \int_E P_{C^2_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A^2_k})\, P_{C^2_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{k+1}}}; \Gamma).$$

Finally, if we inject the previous formula in equation (2.5), we obtain an integral which also corresponds to the case of the semilattice $\mathcal{A}^{2'}$.

Therefore, in both cases, we simplify the integral to get a formula which corresponds to the semilattice $\mathcal{A}^{2'} = \mathcal{A}^2 \setminus \{A^2_k\}$. We proceed by induction, and since the it ends when $\mathcal{A}^2 = \mathcal{A}^1$, we have proved the equality (2.5). □

Given an initial probability measure and a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system, we now construct a canonical $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process. Theorem 2.1 shows how to design the finite-dimensional distributions to which apply the Kolmogorov extension theorem.

In Theorem 2.2, for any indexing collection $\mathcal{A}$, Ω designates the canonical space $E^{\mathcal{A}}$, supplied with its classic sigma-field $\mathcal{F}$ generated by coordinate applications. X is the canonical process, i.e. for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, $X_A(\omega) = \omega(A)$ and $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ corresponds to the natural filtration of X.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A);\, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ and ν be a probability measure ν on $(E, \mathcal{E})$.*

Then, there exists a unique probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that X is a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$, with initial measure ν and $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$, i.e.

$$X_{\emptyset'} \sim \nu \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{P}_\nu(X_A \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C) = P_C(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) \quad \mathbb{P}_\nu\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. To construct the measure $\mathbb{P}_\nu$, we need to define for any $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ a probability measure $\mu_{A_1 \dots A_k}$ on $(E^k, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes k})$, such that this family of probabilities satisfies the classic consistency conditions.

1. Let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be k distinct sets in $\mathcal{A}$ and π be a permutation on $\{1, \dots, k\}$, then

$$\mu_{A_1 \dots A_k}(\Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k) = \mu_{A_{\pi(1)} \dots A_{\pi(k)}}(\Gamma_{\pi(1)} \times \cdots \times \Gamma_{\pi(k)}) \tag{2.6}$$

for any $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k \in \mathcal{E}$.

2. Let $A_1, \dots, A_k, A_{k+1}$ be $k+1$ distinct sets in $\mathcal{A}$, then

$$\mu_{A_1 \dots A_k}(\Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k) = \mu_{A_1 \dots A_k A_{k+1}}(\Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \times E) \tag{2.7}$$

for any $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k \in \mathcal{E}$.

For any $A_1,\dots,A_k$ distinct sets in $\mathcal{A}$, we consider $\mathcal{A}'=\{A'_0=\emptyset',A'_1,\dots,A'_m\}$ the smallest semilattice generated by $\{\emptyset',A_1,\dots,A_k\}$. Let $C_1,\dots,C_m\in\mathcal{C}$ be the left-neighbourhoods on $\mathcal{A}'$: $C_i=A'_i\setminus(\cup_{j=0}^{i-1}A'_j)$. We define the probability measure $\mu_{A_1\dots A_k}$ on $(E^k,\mathcal{E}^{\otimes k})$ as following,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_{A_1\dots A_k}(\Gamma_1\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k)\\&=\int_{E^{m+1}}\nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)\,P_{C_1}(x_0;\mathrm{d}x_{A'_1})\,P_{C_2}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_2}};\mathrm{d}x_{A'_2})\cdots P_{C_m}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}};\mathrm{d}x_{A'_m})\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_k}(x_{A_k}).\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_k\in\mathcal{E}$. We note that for each variable x_{A_i}, $i\in\{1,\dots,k\}$, there exists a corresponding one $x_{A'_{j_i}}$, $j_i\in\{1,\dots,m\}$. We also remark that the formula does not depend on the consistent numbering used for $\mathcal{A}'$, since neither C_i nor $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_i}}$, $i\in\{1,\dots,m\}$ are changed with a different ordering. These two remarks ensure that the previous definition is consistent.

Consider now the first consistency condition that must satisfy $\mu_{A_1\dots A_k}$. Let $A_1,\dots,A_k$ be k distinct sets in $\mathcal{A}$, $\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_k$ be in $\mathcal{E}$ and π be a permutation on $\{1,\dots,k\}$. Then, we know that families $\{A_1,\dots,A_k\}$ and $\{A_{\pi(1)},\dots,A_{\pi(k)}\}$ generate the same semilattice $\mathcal{A}'=\{A'_0=\emptyset',A'_1,\dots,A'_m\}$. And, since the definition of $\mu_{A_1\dots A_k}$ given above does not depend on the ordering of the semilattice $\mathcal{A}'$, we obtain equation (2.6)

To verify the second consistency condition, let $A_1,\dots,A_{k+1}$ be $k+1$ distinct sets in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_k$ be in $\mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathcal{A}^1=\{A^1_0=\emptyset',A^1_1,\dots,A^1_{n_1}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}^2=\{A^2_0=\emptyset',A^2_1,\dots,A^2_{n_2}\}$ be the two semilattices respectively generated by $\{A_1,\dots,A_k\}$ and $\{A_1,\dots,A_k,A_{k+1}\}$. We clearly have $\mathcal{A}^1\subseteq\mathcal{A}^2$. Let $f:E^{n_1}\mapsto\mathbf{R}_+$ be the following positive measurable function,

$$\forall(x_{A^1_1},\dots,x_{A^1_{n_1}})\in E^{n_1};\quad f(x_{A^1_1},\dots,x_{A^1_{n_1}})=\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_k}(x_{A_k}).$$

The definition of f is consistent since $\{A_1,\dots,A_k\}\subseteq\mathcal{A}^1$. Furthermore, if we apply Lemma 2.5 to $\mathcal{A}^1$ and $\mathcal{A}^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{E^{n_1+1}}\nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)\,P_{C^1_1}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^1_0}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^1_1})\cdots P_{C^1_{n_1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^1_{n_1}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^1_{n_1}})\,\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_k}(x_{A_k})\\&=\int_{E^{n_2+1}}\nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)\,P_{C^2_1}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_0}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_1})\cdots P_{C^2_{n_2}}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C^2_{n_2}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A^2_{n_2}})\,\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_k}(x_{A_k})\,\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{R}}(x_{A_{k+1}}),\end{aligned}$$

which exactly corresponds to the second consistency equation (2.7).

Therefore, using Kolmogorov's extension theorem (see e.g. Appendix A in [26]), there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F})$ such that for any $A_1,\dots,A_k$ in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_k$ in $\mathcal{E}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_{A_1}\in\Gamma_1,\dots,X_{A_k}\in\Gamma_k)=\mu_{A_1\dots A_k}(\Gamma_1\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k),$$

where X is the canonical process. A usual monotone class argument ensures the uniqueness of this probability measure.

We have to verify that under $\mathbb{P}_\nu$, X is a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$, and with initial measure ν and $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$. The first point is clear, since for any $\Gamma_0\in\mathcal{E}$, $\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_{\emptyset'}\in\Gamma_0)=\nu(\Gamma_0)$.

Consider now $C=A\setminus B$ in $\mathcal{C}$, where $B=\cup_{i=1}^k A_i$. Let $A'_1,\dots,A'_m$ be in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $A'_i\cap C=\emptyset$ for each $i\in\{1,\dots,m\}$. Without any loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathcal{A}'=\{A'_0=\emptyset',A'_1,\dots,A'_m,A\}$ is a semilattice with consistent numbering and such that $\{A_i\}_{i\leq k}\subseteq$

$\mathcal{A}'$. Let $C_1,\dots,C_m \in \mathcal{C}$ be the left-neighbourhoods $C_i = A'_i \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A'_j)$. We remark that $C = A \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{m} A'_j)$ and $X_{A'_i}$ is $\mathcal{G}^*_C$-measurable for each $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$. Therefore, for any $\Gamma,\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_m \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(X_{A'_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_m}(X_{A'_m})\,\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_A\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_C)\big]\\
&=\mathbb{P}_\nu\big(X_{A'_1}\in\Gamma_1,\dots,X_{A'_m}\in\Gamma_m, X_A\in\Gamma\big)\\
&=\int_E \nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)\Big\{\int_{E^{m+1}} P_{C_1}(x_0;\mathrm{d}x_{A'_1})\cdots P_{C_m}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}};\mathrm{d}x_{A'_m})\,P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\mathrm{d}x_A)\\
&\qquad\qquad \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A'_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_m}(x_{A'_m})\,\mathbf{1}_\Gamma(x_A)\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

We can isolate the integral over x_A, i.e. $\int_E P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\mathrm{d}x_A)\,\mathbf{1}_\Gamma(x_A) = P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma)$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(X_{A'_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_m}(X_{A'_m})\,\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_A\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_C)\big]\\
&=\int_{E^{m+1}} \nu(\mathrm{d}x_0)P_{C_1}(x_0;\mathrm{d}x_{A'_1})\cdots P_{C_m}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}};\mathrm{d}x_{A'_m})\,\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(x_{A'_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_m}(x_{A'_m})P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma)\\
&=\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_1}(X_{A'_1})\cdots\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_m}(X_{A'_m})\,P_C(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma)\big].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using a monotone class argument, we obtain the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property with respect to the natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_A\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_C) = P_C(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\Gamma)$ $\mathbb{P}_\nu$-almost surely for all $C\in\mathcal{C}$ and $\Gamma\in\mathcal{E}$. □

Usual notations $\mathbb{P}_x(\,.\,)$ and $\mathbb{E}_x[\,.\,]$ are used in the sequel in the particular case of Dirac initial distributions $\nu=\delta_x$, $x\in E$. Similarly to the classic Markov theory, if Z is a bounded random variable on the probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$, a monotone class argument shows that the map $x\mapsto\mathbb{E}_x[Z]$ is measurable and for any probability measure ν on $(E,\mathcal{E})$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z] = \int_E \nu(\mathrm{d}x)\,\mathbb{E}_x[Z].$$

2.2. Set-indexed Markov properties

In this section, we compare the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property to the set-indexed Markov literature. Let first recall the definitions of *Markov* and *sharp Markov* properties which have been introduced in [25].

Definition 2.6 (**Markov SI processes** [25]). *A set-indexed process X is said to be* Markov *if for all $B\in\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $A_1,\dots,A_k\in\mathcal{A}$ such that $A_i\not\subseteq B$, $i\in\{1,\dots,k\}$, and for any measurable function $f:\mathbf{R}^k\to\mathbf{R}_+$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{A_1},\dots,X_{A_k})\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_B\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{A_1},\dots,X_{A_k})\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}\cap\mathcal{F}_{\cup_{i=1}^k A_i}\big]\qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

where the sigma field $\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}$ corresponds to $\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}=\sigma\big(\{X_A;\,A\in\mathcal{A}, A\subseteq B, A\not\subseteq B^\circ\}\big)$.

Definition 2.7 (**sharp Markov processes** [25]). *A set-indexed process X is* sharp Markov *if for all $B\in\mathcal{A}(u)$,*

$$\mathcal{F}_B \perp \mathcal{F}_{B^c}\;|\;\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}, \tag{2.8}$$

where for any sigma-fields $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3$*, the notation* $\mathcal{F}_1 \perp \mathcal{F}_2 \mid \mathcal{F}_3$ *means that* $\mathcal{F}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{F}_2$ *are conditionally independent given* $\mathcal{F}_3$*, and the sigma field* $\mathcal{F}_{B^c}$ *is defined by* $\mathcal{F}_{B^c} = \sigma\big(\{X_A;\, A \in \mathcal{A}, A \not\subseteq B\}\big)$*.*

As recall in the introduction, another Markov property, called *set-Markov*, has been described in [5] and deeply studied in both [5] and [4].

Definition 2.8 (**set-Markov processes [5]**)**.** *A set-indexed process* X *is* set-Markov *if for all* $B, B' \in \mathcal{A}(u)$*,* $B \subseteq B'$ *and* $f : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ *measurable function,*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\, f(\Delta X_{B'}) \;\big|\; \mathcal{F}_B \,\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\, f(\Delta X_{B'}) \;\big|\; \Delta X_B \,\big] \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-}a.s.$$

Different relationships between these Markov properties have been proved, respectively, in [25] and [5]:

$$\textit{set-Markov} \Rightarrow \textit{sharp Markov} \quad \text{and} \quad \textit{Markov} \Rightarrow \textit{sharp Markov},$$

where the last implication is an equivalence when the filtration satisfies an assumption of *conditional orthogonality* (see Definition 2.3 in [25] for more details).

We prove in the following proposition that the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property implies both *Markov* and *sharp Markov* properties.

Proposition 2.9. *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ *be a complete probability space and* X *be a* $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov process with respect to* $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$*. Then,* X *is also* Markov *and* Sharp Markov*.*

Proof. Let X be $\mathcal{C}$*-Markov* on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$. Since the *Markov* property implies *Sharp Markov*, we only have to prove that X is *Markov*.

Let $B = \cup_{i=1}^{l} A_i^1 \in \mathcal{A}(u)$ and $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A_i \not\subseteq B$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. The collection of sets $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k, A_1^1, \ldots, A_l^1\}$ generates a semilattice $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_0 = \emptyset', A'_1, \ldots, A'_m\}$. Without any loss of generality, we can suppose that the consistent numbering of $\mathcal{A}'$ is such that there exists $p \leq m$ which satisfies,

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}; \quad A'_i \not\subseteq B \iff i \geq p.$$

We also introduce the usual left-neighbourhoods $C_1, \ldots, C_m \in \mathcal{C}$, $C_i = A'_i \setminus \cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A'_j$. We note that for all $i \in \{p, \ldots, m\}$, since $C_i \cap B = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{F}_B \subseteq G^*_{C_i}$. Then, if f is a measurable function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_{A_1}, \ldots, X_{A_k}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_B \,] &= \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_{A_1}, \ldots, X_{A_k}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{C_m} \,] \;\big|\; \mathcal{F}_B \,\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\mathbf{R}} P_{C_m}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'_m}) \, f(X_{A_1}, \ldots, X_{A_{k-1}}, x_{A'_m}) \;\Big|\; \mathcal{F}_B \Big],
\end{aligned}$$

where we assume that $A'_m = A_k$. Therefore, by induction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_{A_1}, \ldots, X_{A_k}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_B \,] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\mathbf{R}^{m-p+1}} P_{C_p}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_p}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'_p}) \cdots P_{C_m}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'_m}) \, f(x_{A_1}, \ldots, x_{A_k}) \;\Big|\; \mathcal{F}_B \Big] \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^{m-p+1}} P_{C_p}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_p}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'_p}) \cdots P_{C_m}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'_m}) \, f(x_{A_1}, \ldots, x_{A_k}),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

since for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$, $X_{A'_i}$ is $\mathcal{F}_B$-measurable ($A'_i \subseteq B$,).

We also observe that for each $i \in \{p, \dots, m\}$, $A'_i \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^k A_j$, and therefore, $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_i}}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\cup_{j=1}^k A_j}$-measurable. Furthermore, let $U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C_i}}$ such that $U \neq A'_p, \dots, A'_m$. Then, according to the definition of p, $U \subseteq B$. But, since $C_i \cap B = \emptyset$, we also have $U \nsubseteq B^\circ$, and therefore X_U is $\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}$-measurable.

In equation (2.9), since we integrate over the variables $x_{A'_p}, \dots, x_{A'_m}$, the only random variables X_U which are left are such that $U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C_i}}$ and $U \neq A'_p, \dots, A'_m$. Therefore, the integral (2.9) is $\mathcal{F}_{\cup_{j=1}^k A_j}$- and $\mathcal{F}_{\partial B}$-measurable, and we obtain the expected equality,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\,f(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_B\,\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\,f(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k}) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\partial B} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\cup_{i=1}^k A_i}\big].$$

$\square$

Although both *set-Markov* and *$\mathcal{C}$-Markov* properties imply *sharp Markov*, these are nevertheless different Markov properties. Indeed, let simply consider the empirical process $X_A = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_j \in A\}}$, where $(Z_i)_{i \leq n}$ are i.i.d. random variables. It is shown in [5] that X is *set-Markov*, but it can be checked that X is not *$\mathcal{C}$-Markov* (and in fact also not *Markov*). Conversely, the *set-indexed $\mathcal{S}\alpha\mathcal{S}$ Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process* introduced later is a *$\mathcal{C}$-Markov* process which is not *set-Markov* (see Section 2.5).

$\mathcal{C}$-Markov and *set-Markov* properties can be seen as two consistent ways to introduce a set-indexed Markov property which leads to the definition of a transition system $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$, which characterizes entirely the finite-dimensional distributions. If both $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfy a Chapman-Kolmogorov like equation,

$$P_C f = P_{C'} P_{C''} f \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{BB''} f = Q_{BB'} \, Q_{B'B''} f, \tag{2.10}$$

an important difference lies in the indexing used. On one side, $\mathcal{P} = \{P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A); C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ consider variables indexed by $\mathcal{A}$, whereas $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_{BB'}(x_B; \mathrm{d}x_{B'});\ B, B' \in \mathcal{A}(u), B \subseteq B'\}$ used $\mathcal{A}(u)$ as indexing collection.

In fact, as stated in [5], the $\mathcal{Q}$-Markov property concerns the global extension of the process ΔX on $\mathcal{A}(u)$. This explains why a supplementary assumption is needed on the transition system to ensure the existence of ΔX. Indeed, Theorem 1 in [5] requires that the following quantity,

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^{m+1}} \mu(\mathrm{d}x_0) \, \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_0}(x_0) \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_i}(x_i - x_{i-1}) \, Q_{\cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A_j, \cup_{j=0}^{i} A_j}(x_{i-1}; \mathrm{d}x_i), \tag{2.11}$$

must be independent of the ordering of the semilattice $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_0, \dots, A_m\}$ in order to be able to construct the corresponding *$\mathcal{Q}$-Markov* process. We note that this last assumption is not necessary when Q is homogeneous, as proved in [20].

On the other hand, the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property is independent of the existence of an additive extension on $\mathcal{A}(u)$. The indexing collection $\mathcal{A}$ is supposed to satisfy the *Shape* assumption to simplify notations and the set-indexed formalism, but it can be verified that the example of the set-indexed Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process considered in Section 2.5 exists on any indexing collection, and does not have an additive extension when the *Shape* assumption does not hold on $\mathcal{A}$.

2.3. Properties of $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes

In section, we investigate properties such as projections on flows, conditional independence and homogeneity of transition probabilities, related to $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes. Let first recall that an *elementary flow* is a continuous increasing function $f : [a,b] \subset \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathcal{A}$, i.e. such that

(i) Increasing: $\forall s,t \in [a,b]\,; \quad s < t \Rightarrow f(s) \subseteq f(t)$;

(ii) Outer-continuous: $\forall s \in [a,b)\,; \quad f(s) = \bigcap_{v>s} f(v)$;

(iii) Inner-continuous: $\forall s \in (a,b)\,; \quad f(s) = \overline{\bigcup_{u<s} f(u)}$.

We prove in the next proposition that elementary projections of $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes are real-parameter Markov processes.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$.*

Then, for any elementary flow $f : [a,b] \to \mathcal{A}$, the projection X^f of X along f is a Markov process with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}^f = \big(\mathcal{F}_{f(s)}\big)_{s\in[a,b]}$. Furthermore, X^f has the following transition probabilities,

$$\forall s \leq t \in [a,b]\,; \quad P^f_{s,t}(x_s; \mathrm{d}x_t) = P_{f(t)\setminus f(s)}\big(x_{f(s)}; \mathrm{d}x_{f(t)}\big),$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ is the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system of X.

Proof. We simply verify that the Markov property stands with the expected transition probabilities. Let f be an elementary flow and $s \leq t$ be in $[a,b]$. We note that $\mathcal{F}_{f(s)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{f(t)\setminus f(s)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{f(t)\setminus f(s)}} = \{f(s)\}$. Therefore, for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(X^f_t \in \Gamma \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}^f_s\big) &= \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{P}(X_{f(t)} \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{f(t)\setminus f(s)}) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{f(s)}\big) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\,P_{f(t)\setminus f(s)}(X_{f(s)}; \Gamma) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{f(s)}\,] = P^f_{s,t}(X^f_s; \Gamma).\end{aligned}$$

□

We note that the converse result is not true: it is not sufficient to have elementary projections which are Markov to obtain a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process. Furthermore, Proposition 2.10 can not be extended to *simple flows*, i.e. continuous increasing function $f : [a,b] \to \mathcal{A}(u)$, since this property characterizes entirely *set-Markov* processes (Proposition 2 in [5]).

We now prove that the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property implies a commutation property on the filtration. This classic condition is usually called (F4), or *commuting property* in the multiparameter literature, and has been first introduced by Cairoli and Walsh [9] for two-parameter processes and extended to the set-indexed formalism in [24]. We assume in the following Theorem that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ is included in the σ-field $\mathcal{F}^0_\infty := \sigma(\{X_A; A \in \mathcal{A}\})$.

Theorem 2.3 (Conditional independence). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$.*

Then, the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the conditional independence *property (CI), i.e. for all $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$ and for any bounded random variable Y on the space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^0_\infty, \mathbb{P})$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[Y \,|\, \mathcal{F}_U] \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_V\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[Y \,|\, \mathcal{F}_V] \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_U\big] = \mathbb{E}[Y \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{U\cap V}] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof. Let $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$. If $U \subseteq V$ or $V \subseteq U$, the equality is straight-forward. Therefore, we assume $U \nsubseteq V$ and $V \nsubseteq U$. Using a monotone class argument, we only have to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(X_{A_k})\,|\,\mathcal{F}_U\,]\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_V\,\big] = \mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(A_k)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{U\cap V}\,],$$

for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f_1, \dots, f_k : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$ measurable functions. Without any loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_0 = \emptyset', A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ is a semilattice with a consistent numbering which contains the sets U, V and $U \cap V$. We denote as usually $(C_i)_{i\leq k}$ the left-neighbourhoods in $\mathcal{A}'$, i.e. $C_i = A_i \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A_j)$. Finally, we also assume the ordering of $\mathcal{A}'$ is such that there exist $k_{U\cap V}, k_V \in \mathbf{N}$ which satisfy $k_{U\cap V} < k_V$,

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, k_{U\cap V}\};\quad A_i \subseteq A_{k_{U\cap V}} := U \cap V \quad\text{and}\quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k_V\};\quad A_i \subseteq A_{k_V} := V.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(X_{A_k})\,|\,\mathcal{F}_V\,]\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\,\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(X_{A_k})\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_{C_k}\,]\,|\,\mathcal{F}_V\,]\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\,\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\bigg[\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_E P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(x_{A_k})\;\Big|\;\mathcal{F}_V\Big]\;\bigg|\;\mathcal{F}_U\bigg],
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{F}_V \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{C_k}$. Therefore, by induction, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(X_{A_k})\,|\,\mathcal{F}_V\,]\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\,\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\bigg[\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{E^{k-k_V}} P_{C_{k_V+1}}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{k_V+1}}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_{k_V+1}})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) \\
&\qquad\qquad f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_{k_V}(X_{A_{k_V}})\, f_{k_V+1}(x_{A_{k_V+1}})\cdots f_k(x_{A_k})\;\Big|\;\mathcal{F}_V\Big]\;\bigg|\;\mathcal{F}_U\bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Every random variable X_{A_i} which is left in the previous integral is such that $A_i \subseteq V$, and thus $\mathcal{F}_V$-measurable. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{k_{U\cap V}+1, \dots, k_V\}$, we have

$$U \cap C_i \subseteq U \cap (A_i \setminus U \cap V) = (U \cap A_i) \setminus (U \cap V) = \emptyset \quad \text{since } A_i \subseteq V.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_U \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{C_i}$ and still by the induction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(X_{A_k})\,|\,\mathcal{F}_V\,]\;\big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\,\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{E^{k-k_V}} P_{C_{k_V+1}}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{k_V+1}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_{k_V+1}})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) \\
&\qquad\qquad f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_{k_V+1}(x_{A_{k_V+1}})\cdots f_k(x_{A_k})\;\Big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{E^{k-k_{U\cap V}}} P_{C_{k_{U\cap V}+1}}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{k_{U\cap V}+1}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_{k_{U\cap V}+1}})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) \\
&\qquad\qquad f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_{k_{U\cap V}}(X_{A_{k_{U\cap V}}})f_{k_{U\cap V}+1}(x_{A_{k_{U\cap V}+1}})\cdots f_k(x_{A_k})\;\Big|\;\mathcal{F}_U\Big] \\
&= \int_{E^{k-k_{U\cap V}}} \Big\{P_{C_{k_{U\cap V}+1}}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{k_{U\cap V}+1}}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_{k_{U\cap V}+1}})\cdots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}};\mathrm{d}x_{A_k}) \\
&\qquad\qquad f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_{k_{U\cap V}}(X_{A_{k_{U\cap V}}})f_{k_{U\cap V}+1}(x_{A_{k_{U\cap V}+1}})\cdots f_k(x_{A_k})\Big\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\,f_1(X_{A_1})\cdots f_k(A_k)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{U\cap V}\,],
\end{aligned}$$

since random variables X_{A_i} which are left in the integral are $\mathcal{F}_{U\cap V}$-measurable ($A_i \subseteq U\cap V$ for all $i\in\{1,\dots,k_{U\cap V}\}$). □

In the next theorem, we investigate the extension of the *simple Markov property* to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov formalism. In order to introduce the concept of *homogeneous $\mathcal{C}$-transition system*, we assume that there exists a collection of shift operators $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ which satisfies:

(i) for any $U\in\mathcal{A}$ such that $U^\circ\neq\emptyset$, we have $A\subset(\theta_U(A))^\circ$ for all $A\in\mathcal{A}$;
(ii) for any $A\in\mathcal{A}$, $U\mapsto\theta_U(A)$ is an increasing monotone outer-continuous function with $\theta_{\emptyset'}(A)=A$;
(iii) for any $U\in\mathcal{A}$, θ_U is stable under intersections and $\theta_U(\emptyset')=U$.

For any $U\in\mathcal{A}$, the operator θ_U is extended on $\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$\theta_U(B)=\cup_{i=1}^k\theta_U(A_i)\quad\text{and}\quad\theta_U(C)=\theta_U(A)\setminus\theta_U(B),$$

for all $B=\cup_{i=1}^k A_i\in\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $C=A\setminus B\in\mathcal{C}$.

To illustrate this notion, let simply consider the multiparameter setting $\{[0,t];t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N\}$. Then, the natural family $(\theta_u)_{u\in\mathcal{T}}$ of shift operators corresponds to the usual translation on $\mathbf{R}_+^N$, i.e.

$$\forall u,t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N;\quad \theta_u(t)=\theta_{[0,u]}\big([0,t]\big):=[0,t+u]\,.$$

We can easily check that $(\theta_u)_{u\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ satisfy the previous conditions.

Let now introduce the notion of *homogeneous $\mathcal{C}$-transition system.*

Definition 2.11 (**Homogeneous $\mathcal{C}$-transition system**). *A $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be* homogeneous *with respect to $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$ if it satisfies*

$$\forall U\in\mathcal{A}, C=A\setminus B\in\mathcal{C};\quad P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};\mathrm{d}x_A)=P_{\theta_U(C)}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_U(C)}};\mathrm{d}x_{\theta_U(A)}).$$

A $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process is said to be homogeneous *w.r.t $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$ if its $\mathcal{C}$-transition system is itself homogeneous.*

We can now establish a *simple $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property.* We consider in the following theorem the canonical space $\Omega = E^{\mathcal{A}}$ and the canonical process X.

Theorem 2.4 (**Simple $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property**). *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an homogeneous $\mathcal{C}$-transition system w.r.t $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$. Then, the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process X satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[f(X\circ\theta_U) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_U \big] = \mathbb{E}_{X_U}\big[f(X) \big] \quad \mathbb{P}_\nu\text{-}a.s.,$$

for all $U \in \mathcal{A}$, $f : E^{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ measurable function and ν initial measure.

Proof. Let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be in $\mathcal{A}$. Without any loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_0 = \emptyset', A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ is a semilattice with consistent numbering. As usually, $C_1, \dots, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ denote the left-neighbourhoods $C_i = A_i \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A_j)$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then, for any measurable function $h : E^k \to \mathbf{R}_+$ and for all $U \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[h(X_{\theta_U(A_1)}, \dots, X_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_U \big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbb{E}_\nu[h(X_{\theta_U(A_1)}, \dots, X_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_{\theta_U(C_k)}] \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_U \big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\int_{\mathbf{R}} P_{\theta_U(C_k)}(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_U(C_k)}}; \mathrm{d}x_{\theta_U(A_k)})\, h(X_{\theta_U(A_1)}, \dots, X_{\theta_U(A_{k-1})}, x_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_U \Big],
\end{aligned}$$

since for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $\theta_U(C_i) \cap U = \emptyset$, and therefore $\mathcal{F}_U \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*_{\theta_U(C_k)}$. By induction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[h(X_{\theta_U(A_1)}, \dots, X_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_U \big] \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^k} P_{\theta_U(C_1)}(X_U; \mathrm{d}x_{\theta_U(A_1)}) \dots P_{\theta_U(C_k)}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_U(C_k)}}; \mathrm{d}x_{\theta_U(A_k)})\, h(x_{\theta_U(A_1)}, \dots, x_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}^k} P_{C_1}(X_U; \mathrm{d}x_{A_1}) \dots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_k})\, h(x_{A_1}, \dots, x_{A_k}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X_U}[h(X_{A_1}, \dots, X_{A_k})],
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{P}$ is homogeneous and $\theta_U(C_1) = \theta_U(A_1) \setminus \theta_U(\emptyset') = \theta_U(A_1) \setminus U$. A monotone class argument induces the expected result. ☐

2.4. $\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes

In this section is investigated the extension of classic results on Feller processes to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov formalism. In this purpose, we first need to recall the assumption of *separability from above* on the indexing collection $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 2.12 (**Separability from above**). *There exist an increasing sequence of finite subclasses $\mathcal{A}_n = \{A_1^n, \dots, A_{k_n}^n\}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ closed under intersections and such that $B_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$; a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ decreasing to 0 and a sequence of functions $g_n : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}_n \cup \{\mathcal{T}\}$ such that*

(i) for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A = \cap_n g_n(A)$;
(ii) g_n preserves arbitrary intersections and finite unions;
(iii) for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \subseteq (g_n(A))^\circ$;
(iv) $g_n(A) \subseteq g_m(A)$ if $n \geq m$;

(v) for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $d_H(A, g_n(A)) \leq \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $g_n(A) \subseteq B_n$,

where d_H denotes the Hausdorff distance.

We remark that the previous definition is slightly stronger than the usual one presented in [24] since each g_n is supposed to be $\mathcal{A}_n$-valued, and not $\mathcal{A}_n(u)$. For any filtration $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$, the family $(g_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ allows to define an augmented filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ given by

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{A}; \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_A := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_{g_n(A)}.$$

$(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B)_{B\in\mathcal{A}(u)}$ and $(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C)_{C\in\mathcal{C}}$ given by equation (1.2) respectively denote the extensions of this filtration on $\mathcal{A}(u)$ and $\mathcal{C}$.

In the classic theory of Markov processes, a Feller semigroup P must satisfy the condition $P_t f \to_{t\to 0} f$. Therefore, to adapt such a formula to the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov formalism, we must define a pseudo-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}}$ on the class of increments $\mathcal{C}$. For this purpose, let introduce a few more notations related to $\mathcal{C}$. For any $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$, we assume that the numbering $B = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$ is such that $d_H(A, A_1) \leq \ldots \leq d_H(A, A_k)$. Then, we define a map $\psi_C : \{U_C^0, U_C^1, \ldots, U_C^p\} \to \{U_C^1, \ldots, U_C^p\}$ constructed as following (we recall that the definition of $(U_C^i)_{i\leq p}$ is given in the introduction):

1. $\psi_C(U_C^0) = A_1$, where by convention $U_C^0 = A$;
2. $\psi_C(U_C^1) = A_1$, where it is assumed that $U_C^1 = A_1$;
3. let $i \in \{2, \ldots, p\}$ and $V = A_1 \cap U_C^i$. According to equation (2.1), we observe that $X_{A_1} = \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} X_{A_1 \cap U_C^i}$, which implies the existence of $j > i$ such that $V = A_1 \cap U_C^j$. Consequently, we set
$$\psi_C(U_C^i) = U_C^j \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_C(U_C^j) = U_C^j. \tag{2.12}$$
By induction, we obtain a complete definition of ψ_C.

We observe that the construction of ψ_C implies that ΔX satisfies

$$\Delta X_C = \big(X_A - X_{\psi_C(A)}\big) - \left[\sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} \big(X_{U_C^i} - X_{\psi_C(U_C^i)}\big)\right]. \tag{2.13}$$

The map ψ_C allows us to define the pseudo-norms $\|C\|_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}\|_{\mathcal{C}}$:

$$\|C\|_{\mathcal{C}} := \max_{0\leq i\leq p} d_H\big(U_C^i, \psi_C(U_C^i)\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}\|_{\mathcal{C}} := \max_{0\leq i\leq p} d_E\big(x_{U_C^i}, x_{\psi_C(U_C^i)}\big). \tag{2.14}$$

Finally, for any $m \in \mathbf{N}$, let $\mathcal{C}^m$ denotes the sub-class $\{C \in \mathcal{C}\,;\ |\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}| \leq m \text{ and } C \subseteq B_m\}$.

We can now introduce the definition of *Feller $\mathcal{C}$-transition systems* and *$\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes.*

Definition 2.13 (**$\mathcal{C}$-Feller transition system**). *A $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be* Feller *if it satisfies the following conditions:*

1. *for any $f \in C_0(E)$ and for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$,*
$$P_C f \in C_0\big(E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|}\big),$$
where for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $C_0(E^k)$ denotes the usual space of continuous functions that vanish at infinity;

2. for any $f \in C_0(E)$ and for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \sup_{\substack{C=C'\cup C''\in\mathcal{C}^m \\ \|C'\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq\rho}} \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}},\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}} \\ \|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq\rho}} \left| P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) - P_{C''} f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}) \right| = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

where, similarly to Definition 2.1, the sets C, C' and C'' are such that $C' = C \cap A'$ and $C'' = C \setminus A'$, with $A' \in \mathcal{A}$.

A $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process X is said to be $\mathcal{C}$-Feller *if its $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ is Feller.*

The definition of a $\mathcal{C}$-Feller transition system, and especially equation (2.15), may seem a bit cumbersome, but in the one-dimensional case and if $\mathcal{P}$ is homogeneous, it corresponds to the classic Feller property $\lim_{t\to 0} \sup_{s\geq 0} \|P_{s+t} f - P_s f\|_\infty = 0$.

Moreover, in the case of simple increments $C' = U \setminus V$ and $C'' = \emptyset$, we obtain a more classic formula

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \sup_{\substack{U,V\in\mathcal{A},\, U\subseteq V\subset B_m \\ d_H(U,U\cap V)\leq\rho}} \left\| P_{U\setminus V} f - f \right\|_\infty = 0 \tag{2.16}$$

since $\|U \setminus V\|_{\mathcal{C}} = d_H(U, U\cap V)$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{U\setminus V}}\|_{\mathcal{C}} = d_E(x_U, x_{U\cap V})$.

Equation (2.15) is also more complex than in the classic theory because in the context of set-indexed and multiparameter processes, we prefer the homogeneous hypothesis to be distinct from the $\mathcal{C}$-Feller property. This decision is motivated by the existence of interesting $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes which are Feller but not homogeneous (e.g. the multiparameter Brownian sheet).

In the following results, we assume that the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process X have outer-continuous sample paths, meaning that:

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{A},\ \forall \varepsilon > 0,\ \exists \alpha > 0; \quad A \subseteq U \in \mathcal{A} \ \text{ and } \ d_H(A,U) \leq \alpha \implies d_E(X_A, X_U) \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.17}$$

We can now generalize a classic result from the theory of Markov processes.

Theorem 2.5 (**$\mathcal{C}$-Markov w.r.t the augmented filtration**). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X be a $\mathcal{C}$-Feller process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ which has outer-continuous sample paths. Then, X is $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with respect to the augmented filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$, i.e. X satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C \,] = \mathbb{E}[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \,] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f : E \mapsto \mathbf{R}_+$ measurable.

Proof. Let $C = A \setminus B$ be in $\mathcal{C}$, with $B = \cup_{j=1}^k A_j$. We assume that the numbering of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C} = \{U_C^1, \dots, U_C^p\}$ is consistent. Let $\rho_0 > 0$ be $\max_{1\leq i<j\leq p} d_H(U_C^i, U_C^j)$. Then, for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$, let C_i^n and D_i^n denote the following increments,

$$C_i^n = A \setminus \left(B \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} g_n(U_C^j) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad D_i^n = g_n(U_C^i) \setminus \left(B \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} g_n(U_C^j) \right),$$

where by convention $g_n(U_C^{p+1}) = A$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, let $D_i^n = g_n(U_C^i) \setminus \left(\cup_{j=1}^{k_i} A_j^i \right)$ be the extremal representation of D_i^n. As previously said, it is assumed that the numbering is such that $d_H(g_n(U_C^i), A_1^i) \leq \cdots \leq d_H(g_n(U_C^i), A_{k_i}^i)$. For each j, according to the definition of D_i^n, there exist l_j such that

$$A_j^i = g_n(U_C^i) \cap U_C^{l_j} \quad \text{or} \quad A_j^i = g_n(U_C^i) \cap g_n(U_C^{l_j}) = g_n(U_C^i \cap U_C^{l_j}).$$

Since $U_C^i \subseteq B$, there exists $j \leq k_i$ such that $U_C^i \subseteq A_j^i \subset g_n(U_C^i)$. Therefore, as the family $(g_n)_n$ satisfies assumption *(v)*, we have $d_H(g_n(U_C^i), A_j^i) \to 0$ and A_j^i converges to U_C^i.

If we consider the particular case of A_1^i, we obtain that $d_H(g_n(U_C^i), A_1^i) \to 0$ and A_1^i converges to an element $V := U_C^i \cap U_C^{l_1} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}$. Let suppose $V \neq U_C^i$, implying that $d_H(V, U_C^i) \geq \rho_0$. We know that $d_H(A_1^i, V) \to 0$, $d_H(g_n(U_C^i), A_1^i) \to 0$ and $d_H(g_n(U_C^i), U_C^i) \to 0$, which is in contradiction with the previous hypothesis. Therefore, $U_C^i \cap U_C^{l_1} = U_C^i$.

Then, let $V_n \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{D_i^n}}$. According to the definition of D_i^n, V_n must have the following general form

$$V_n = U_C^{j_V} \cap g_n(U_C^{l_V}) \cap g_n(U_C^i) \quad \text{where } j_V, l_V \in \{1, \dots, p\}.$$

Therefore, $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence which converges to $U_C^{j_V} \cap U_C^{l_V} \cap U_C^i := U_C^{k_V}$. Since A_1^i converges to U_C^i, $V_n \cap A_1^i$ is a decreasing sequence whose limit is also $U_C^{k_V}$. Hence, according to definition (2.12) of $\psi_{D_i^n}$, we know that both V_n and $\psi_{D_i^n}(V_n)$ converge to $U_C^{k_V}$, and as the family $(g_n)_n$ satisfies the assumption *(v)*, for any $\rho > 0$, there exists N_ρ such that

$$\forall n \geq N_\rho; \quad d_H\Big(V_n, \psi_{D_i^n}(V_n)\Big) \leq \rho.$$

Furthermore, since the sample paths of X are outer-continuous, N_ρ can be suppose large enough to satisfy

$$\forall n \geq N_\rho; \quad d_E\Big(X_{V_n}, X_{U_C^{k_V}}\Big) \leq \rho \quad \text{and} \quad d_E\Big(X_{\psi_{D_i^n}(V_n)}, X_{U_C^{k_v}}\Big) \leq \rho$$

Finally, as the two previous properties are satisfied uniformly for any $V_n \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{D_i^n}}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we obtain that for all $n \geq N_\rho$,

$$\big\|D_i^n\big\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{D_i^n}}\big\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq \rho. \tag{2.18}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $f \in C_0(E)$. According to Definition 2.13, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{C = C' \cup C'' \in \mathcal{C}^m \\ \|C'\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq \rho}} \ \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}} \\ \|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq \rho}} \big|P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) - P_{C''} f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}})\big| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We observe that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $C_{i+1}^n = C_i^n \setminus g_n(U_C^i)$ and $D_i^n = C_i^n \cap g_n(U_C^i)$, and there exists $m \in \mathbf{N}$ such that C_i^n and D_i^n belong to $\mathcal{C}^m$.

Therefore, according to the Feller property and inequalities (2.18), we obtain

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}; \quad \big|P_{C_i^n} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_i^n}}) - P_{C_{i+1}^n} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{i+1}^n}})\big| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thereby, by induction and since $C_1^n = C$, we have $\big|P_C f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) - P_{C_{p+1}^n} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{p+1}^n}})\big| \leq p\varepsilon$, for all $n \geq N_\rho$, which proves that $P_{C_{p+1}^n} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{p+1}^n}}) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} P_C f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}})$ almost surely.

As we notice that for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_C^* \subset \mathcal{G}_{C_{p+1}^n}^*$, we can eventually prove the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property with respect to the augmented filtration:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_A) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_C^*\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[f(X_A) \,|\, \mathcal{G}_{C_{k+1}^n}^*] \,\big|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_C^*\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[P_{C_{p+1}^n} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C_{p+1}^n}}) \,\big|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_C^*\big].$$

And, using the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\, f(X_A) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C \big] = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\big[\, P_{C^n_{p+1}} f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C^n_{p+1}}}) \;\big|\; \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C \big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\, P_C f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C \big] = P_C f(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}).$$

since $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_C$-measurable. □

Before establishing a *strong $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property*, we recall the definition of a *simple stopping set*, as introduced in [24]. A *simple stopping set* is an application $\xi : \Omega \to \mathcal{A}$ such that for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\{\omega : A \subseteq \xi(\omega)\} \in \mathcal{F}_A$. If the assumption *Shape* holds on the collection $\mathcal{A}$, we can define the σ-algebra of the events prior to ξ:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\xi = \big\{ F \in \mathcal{F} : F \cap \{\xi \subseteq B\} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B,\ \forall B \in \mathcal{A}(u) \big\}.$$

According to [24], if X has outer-continuous sample paths, X_ξ is $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\xi$-measurable.

Theorem 2.6 (**Strong $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property**). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and X be a $\mathcal{C}$-Feller process with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_A)_{A\in\mathcal{A}}$ with outer-continuous sample paths. Let also ξ be a bounded simple stopping set, i.e. such that $\xi \subseteq V$ almost surely, with a given $V \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Then, if the $\mathcal{C}$-Feller transition system $\mathcal{P}$ of X is homogeneous *w.r.t $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$, X satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\, f(X \circ \theta_\xi) \;\big|\; \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\xi \big] = \mathbb{E}_{X_\xi}\big[\, f(X) \big] \quad \mathbb{P}_\nu\text{-a.s.}$$

for any initial measure ν and $f : E^{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ measurable application.

Proof. Let F be in $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\xi$, $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_0 = \emptyset', A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ be a finite semilattice of $\mathcal{A}$, $C_1, \dots, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ be the left-neighbourhoods $C_i = A_i \setminus (\cup_{j=0}^{i-1} A_j)$, with $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

According to Lemma 1.5.4 [24], for any $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $g_n(\xi)$ is a discrete simple stopping set which satisfies $\xi = \cap_n g_n(\xi)$ and as $\xi \subset g_n(\xi)$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\xi \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{g_n(\xi)}$. Therefore, $F \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{g_n(\xi)}$ and we obtain for any $h \in C_0(E)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})] = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h(X_{\theta_{g_n(\xi)}(A_k)})],$$

since X and $U \mapsto \theta_U$ are outer-continuous. Furthermore, as $g_n(\xi)$ is a discrete stopping set and $F \cap \{g_n(\xi) = U\} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_U \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_{\theta_U(C_k)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})] &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{U\in\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{F\cap\{g_n(\xi)=U\}}\, h(X_{\theta_U(A_k)})\big] \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{U\in\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{F\cap\{g_n(\xi)=U\}}\, \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[h(X_{\theta_U(A_k)}) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^*_{\theta_U(C_k)}\big]\big].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property and the homogeneity of $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})] &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{U\in\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{F\cap\{g_n(\xi)=U\}}\, P_{\theta_U(C_k)} h(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_U(C_k)}})\big] \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{U\in\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_{F\cap\{g_n(\xi)=U\}}\, P_{C_k} h(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_U(C_k)}})\big] \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, P_{C_k} h(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_{g_n(\xi)}(C_k)}})].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $P_{C_k} h \in C_0(E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_{C_k}}|})$ and X is outer-continuous, the dominated convergence theorem leads to the equality

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})] = \mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, P_{C_k} h(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_\xi(C_k)}})].$$

By induction, we extend the reasoning to any collection $h_1, \dots, h_k$ in $C_0(E)$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h_1(X_{\theta_\xi(A_1)}) \cdots h_k(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{1}_F\, h_1(X_{\theta_\xi(A_1)}) \cdots h_{k-1}(X_{\theta_\xi(A_{k-1})})\, P_{C_k} h_k(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\theta_\xi(C_k)}})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\mathbf{1}_F \int_{\mathbf{R}^k} P_{C_1}(X_\xi; \mathrm{d}x_{A_1}) \dots P_{C_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_k}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_k})\, h_1(x_{A_1}) \dots h_k(x_{A_k})\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

since $\theta_\xi(\emptyset') = \xi$. This formula corresponds to the expected equality

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_F\, h_1(X_{\theta_\xi(A_1)}) \cdots h_k(X_{\theta_\xi(A_k)})\big] = \mathbb{E}_\nu\big[\mathbf{1}_F\, \mathbb{E}_{X_\xi}[h_1(X_{A_1}) \cdots h_k(X_{A_k})]\big].$$

□

In Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 are considered $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes with outer-continuous sample paths. The question of the regularity of set-indexed processes is known to be non-trivial and more complex than in the multiparameter setting. Indeed, as exhibited in [1], there exist indexing collections on which the set-indexed Brownian motion is not continuous (and even not bounded). Different approaches have been investigated in the literature, using the metric entropy theory [1, 2] or more recently, the set-indexed formalism [21], to study this question. In this paper is only examined the multiparameter case in Section 3.

2.5. Applications and examples

To conclude this general study of the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property, we present several examples of $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes which are natural extensions of classic real-parameter processes.

Example 2.1 (**Processes with independent increments**)**.** A set-indexed process X has independent increments if for all disjoints sets $C_1, \dots, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$, $\Delta X_{C_1}, \dots, \Delta X_{C_k}$ are independent. Or equivalently, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, ΔX_C is independent of $\mathcal{G}^*_C$.

Let P_{X_C} be the law of the increment ΔX_C. Then, for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_A \in \Gamma \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C) &= \mathbb{P}(\Delta X_C \in \Gamma - \Delta X_B \,|\, \mathcal{G}^*_C) \\
&= P_{X_C}(\Gamma - \Delta X_B) := P_C(\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) \quad \text{according to equation (2.1).}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, set-indexed process with independent increments satisfy the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property. As proved in [5], these processes are also *set-Markov*.

Example 2.2 (**Set-indexed Lévy processes**)**.** Set-indexed Lévy processes have been defined and studied mainly by Adler and Feigin [2], Bass and Pyke [7] in the particular case of subsets of $\mathbf{R}^N$, and by Herbin and Merzbach [20] in the general set-indexed formalism. In this last article, a set-indexed Lévy process X on a measure space $(\mathcal{T}, m)$ is characterized by the following conditions:

1) $X_{\emptyset'} = 0$ almost surely;
2) X has independent increments;
3) X has m-stationary $\mathcal{C}_0$-increments, i.e. for all $V \in \mathcal{A}$ and for all increasing sequences $(U_i)_{i\leq n}$ and $(A_i)_{i\leq n}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $m(U_i \setminus V) = m(A_i)$, we have
$$\big(\Delta X_{U_1\setminus V}, \dots, \Delta X_{U_n\setminus V}\big) \overset{\mathrm{d}}{=} \big(\Delta X_{A_1}, \dots, \Delta X_{A_n}\big);$$
4) X is continuous in probability.

According to [20], for any set-indexed Lévy process X, there exists an infinitely divisible measure μ on $(E, \mathcal{E})$ such that for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $P_{X_C} = \mu^{m(C)}$. Since X has independent increments, it is a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with the following $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\forall C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \forall \Gamma \in \mathcal{E}; \quad P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) = \mu^{m(C)}(\Gamma - \Delta x_B). \tag{2.19}$$

Conversely, we show, using the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property, that a Lévy process can be constructed from any infinitely divisible measure μ. Indeed, let prove $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the three conditions from Definition 2.1.

1) For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A)$ is clearly a transition probability;
2) As $m(\emptyset) = 0$, we have $P_\emptyset(x; \mathrm{d}y) = \delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$;
3) For any $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}$, let $C' = C \cap A'$ and $C'' = C \setminus A'$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, we observe that
$$\mu^{m(C)} = \mu^{m(C')} * \mu^{m(C'')} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{A'} + \Delta x_B = \Delta x_{A'\cup B} + \Delta x_{A'\cap B},$$
using $m(C) = m(C') + m(C'')$ and the inclusion-exclusion principle. These two equalities induces the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation (2.2).

We observe that the construction procedure given in [20] is in fact completely equivalent to the proof of Theorem 2.2 (in fact more general in the case of Lévy processes since the *Shape* assumption is not required on the collection $\mathcal{A}$).

We can easily verify that the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system is homogeneous w.r.t $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if the measure m is compatible with the family operators, i.e. $\forall U \in \mathcal{A}$, $\forall C \in \mathcal{C}$; $m(C) = m(\theta_U(C))$.

Furthermore, if the measure m and the Hausdorff metric d_H satisfy the following mild condition,
$$\forall m \in \mathbf{N} \quad \exists K_m > 0 \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{C}^m; \quad m(C) \leq K_m \|C\|_{\mathcal{C}}, \tag{2.20}$$
then the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ of a Lévy process is Feller. Indeed, let $f \in C_0(E)$. For all $C = C' \cup C''$, we know that

$$P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) = \int_E \mu^{m(C'')}(\mathrm{d}x_A) \bigg\{ \int_E f(x_A + x_{A'} + \Delta x_B)\, \mu^{m(C')}(\mathrm{d}x_{A'}) \bigg\}. \tag{2.21}$$

Using the Feller property of one-dimensional Lévy processes, we obtain

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \sup_{\substack{C'\in\mathcal{C}\\ m(C')\leq\rho}} \sup_{y\in E} \left| \int_E f(x_{A'} + y)\, \mu^{m(C')}(\mathrm{d}x_{A'}) - f(y) \right| = 0.$$

Furthermore, if $\|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}\| \leq \rho$, equation (2.13) proves that $|\Delta x_{C'}| \leq m\rho$. Hence, since $\Delta x_{B''} = \Delta x_{C'} + \Delta x_B$ and $f \in C_0(E)$, we get

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \sup_{\substack{C'\in\mathcal{C} \\ m(C')\leq\rho}} \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}},\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}} \\ \|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq\rho}} \left| \int_E f(x_A + x_{A'} + \Delta x_B)\, \mu^{m(C')}(\mathrm{d}x_{A'}) - f(x_A + \Delta x_{B''}) \right| = 0.$$

Assumption (2.20), equation (2.21) and this last equality induce the Feller property.

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \sup_{\substack{C=C'\cup C''\in\mathcal{C}^m \\ \|C'\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq\rho}} \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}},\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}} \\ \|\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq\rho}} \left| P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) - P_{C''} f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}) \right| = 0.$$

In the particular case of the set-indexed Brownian motion, we observe that according to equation 2.19, $\mathcal{P}$ is characterized by the following transition densities

$$\forall C = A\setminus B \in \mathcal{C};\quad p_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; y) = \frac{1}{\big(2\pi\, m(C)\big)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{\|y-\Delta x_B\|_2^2}{2m(C)}}.$$

Finally, we note that Theorem 2.3 extends the Cairoli-Walsh Commutation Theorem (see e.g. in [41]) to the set-indexed formalism, showing that the Brownian motion history is a commuting filtration.

Example 2.3 (Set-indexed α-stable Ornstein-Uhlenbeck). The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process is a well-known stochastic process, which has the following integral representation (see e.g. [40]):

$$X_t = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} M(\mathrm{d}u), \tag{2.22}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and M is symmetric α-stable random measure ($\alpha \in (0,2]$) with Lebesgue control measure.

A set-indexed extension of this process can not be directly deduced from equation (2.22), Nevertheless, as X is also a Markov process, we can introduce a $\mathcal{C}$-transition system which generalizes the OU Markov kernel.

More precisely, on the space $(E,\mathcal{E}) = (\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}))$, a *set-indexed α-stable Ornstein-Uhlenbeck* process is defined as the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process with initial distribution ν and $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ given by

$$\forall \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \in E^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|};\quad P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\sigma_C X + e^{-\lambda m(A)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i}\, x_{U_C^i}\, e^{\lambda m(U_C^i)} \right] \right) \right] \tag{2.23}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,2]$, X is a symmetric α-stable variable $S_\alpha(1,0,0)$, $f : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$ is a measurable function and σ_C corresponds to

$$\sigma_C^\alpha = \frac{\sigma^\alpha}{\alpha\lambda}\left(1 - e^{-\alpha\lambda m(A)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} e^{\alpha\lambda m(U_C^i)} \right] \right). \tag{2.24}$$

Let prove that $\mathcal{P}$ is a well-defined $\mathcal{C}$-transition system.

1) For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A)$ is clearly a transition probability;

2) $P_\emptyset(x; \mathrm{d}y) = \delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$ since $\sigma_\emptyset = 0$;

3) for any $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{A}$, let $C' = C \cap A'$ and $C'' = C \setminus A'$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Let prove $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies

$$P_C f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) = P_{C'} P_{C''} f := \int_{E^2} P_{C'}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A'})\, P_{C''}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}; \mathrm{d}x_A) f(x_A).$$

where $f : E \mapsto \mathbf{R}_+$ is a measurable function. Using equation (2.23), we observe that

$$P_{C''} f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}) = \mathbb{E}\Bigg[f\Bigg(\sigma_{C''} X + e^{-\lambda m(A)}\Bigg[\sum_{i=2}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i}\, x_{U^i_{C''}}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_{C''})}\Bigg] + x_{A'} e^{-\lambda m(A \setminus A')}\Bigg)\Bigg],$$

where the numbering of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}$ is supposed to satisfy $U^1_{C''} = A'$. Then, if $\widetilde{X}$ is random variable $S_\alpha(1,0,0)$ independent of X, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{C'} P_{C''} f = \mathbb{E}\Bigg[f\Bigg(&\sigma_{C''} X + e^{-\lambda m(A)}\Bigg[\sum_{i=2}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon''_i}\, x_{U^i_{C''}}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_{C''})}\Bigg] \\ &+ \Bigg\{\sigma_{C'} \widetilde{X} + e^{-\lambda m(A')}\Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon'_i}\, x_{U^i_{C'}}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_{C'})}\Bigg]\Bigg\} e^{-\lambda m(A \setminus A')}\Bigg)\Bigg]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbf{R}$ be the deterministic map $h(A) = x_A e^{\lambda m(A)}$. It has an additive extension Δh on $\mathcal{A}(u)$, which satisfies according to equation (2.1):

$$\Delta h(B \cup A') = \sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C''}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon''_i}\, x_{U^i_{C''}}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_{C''})} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta h(B \cap A') = \sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C'}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon'_i}\, x_{U^i_{C'}}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_{C'})}$$

Furthermore, using the inclusion-exclusion principle, we observe that

$$\Delta h(B \cup A') - h(A') + \Delta h(B \cap A') = \Delta h(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}|} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i}\, x_{U^i_C}\, e^{\lambda m(U^i_C)}.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$P_{C'} P_{C''} f(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}) = \mathbb{E}\Big[f\Big(\sigma_{C''} X + \sigma_{C'} e^{-\lambda m(A \setminus A')} \widetilde{X} + e^{-\lambda m(A)} \Delta h(B)\Big)\Big].$$

Since X and $\widetilde{X}$ are two independent $\mathcal{S}\alpha\mathcal{S}$ variables, we know that $\sigma_{C''} X + \sigma_{C'} e^{-\lambda m(A \setminus A')} \sim S_\alpha(\sigma, 0, 0)$, where

$$\sigma^\alpha = \sigma^\alpha_{C'} + \sigma^\alpha_{C''} e^{-\alpha \lambda m(A \setminus A')}.$$

Then, using equations (2.24) and (2.1), a similar reasoning proves that $\sigma = \sigma_C$, and therefore implies the expected the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation $P_C f = P_{C'} P_{C''} f$.

Hence, we have proved that such a $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process exists. One can easily verify that in the case of $\mathcal{A} = \{[0,t]\,;t\in\mathbf{R}_+\}$, the Markov kernel of the classic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process is obtained.

The specific Gaussian case $\alpha = 2$ is studied in more details in [6]. $\mathcal{P}$ is then characterized by the following transition densities

$$p_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}};y) = \frac{1}{\sigma_C\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2\sigma_C^2}\left(y - e^{-\lambda m(A)}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{\boldsymbol{C}}|}(-1)^{\varepsilon_i}\,x_{U_C^i}\,e^{\lambda m(U_C^i)}\right]\right)^2\right],$$

Furthermore, if ν is a Dirac distribution δ_x, X is Gaussian process such that for all $U,V\in\mathcal{A}$

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_U] = xe^{-\lambda m(U)} \quad\text{and}\quad \operatorname{Cov}_x(X_U,X_V) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\lambda}\big(e^{-\lambda m(U\Delta V)} - e^{-\lambda(m(U)+m(V))}\big).$$

Results obtained [6] argue that X is natural extension of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and also gives a natural justification of the expression of $\mathcal{P}$ (equations (2.23) and (2.24)).

Finally, similarly to set-indexed Lévy processes, we observe that $\mathcal{P}$ is homogeneous when the measure m is compatible with the family of operators $(\theta_U)_{U\in\mathcal{A}}$ and Feller under the mild condition (2.20).

3. Multiparameter $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes

After the introduction of any set-indexed concept, it seems natural to examine it the particular case of the multiparameter setting. Consequently, in this section, $\mathcal{T}$ is set to $\mathbf{R}_+^N$ and $\mathcal{A}$ to the indexing collection $\{[0,t];t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N\}$. As previously said, the family $(\theta_u)_{u\in\mathcal{T}}$ of shift operators correspond to the natural translation: $\theta_u(t) = \theta_{[0,u]}\big([0,t]\big) := [0,t+u]$.

3.1. Right-continuous modification of $\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes

We begin by extending a classic result of the theory of Markov processes: multiparameter $\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes have a right-continuous modification which $\mathcal{C}$-Markov with respect to the augmented filtration.

In the sequel, E_Δ denotes the usual one-point compactification of E, i.e. the set $E\cup\{\Delta\}$ endowed with the following topology: $A\subset E_\Delta$ is open if either $A\subset E$ is open in the topology of E or there exists a compact $K\subset E$ such that $A = E_\Delta\setminus K$.

Theorem 3.1 (Càd modification). *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ be a multiparameter process, $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ a filtration and $(\mathbb{P}_x)_{x\in E}$ a collection of probability measures such that for all $x\in E$, X is a $\mathcal{C}$-Feller process on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P}_x)$, with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$, and $\mathbb{P}_x(X_0 = x) = 1$.*

Then, there exists an E_Δ-valued process $(\widetilde{X}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ which has right-continuous sample paths in E_Δ, and such that for any $x\in E$ and all $t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N$, $\widetilde{X}_t = X_t$ $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s. Furthermore, $\widetilde{X}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-Feller process on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P}_x)$ with respect to the augmented filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{\varphi_n;\, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be a collection of functions in $C_0^+(E)$ which separates points in E_Δ, i.e., for any $x, y \in E_\Delta$, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(y)$. For all $r \in \mathbf{Q}_+^N$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, let the process M^r be given by

$$\forall t \preceq r \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad M_t^r = P_{[0,r]\setminus[0,t]}\varphi(X_t).$$

For any $x \in E$, M^r is martingale with respect to the natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N}$ of X:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \prec t' \preceq r \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad \mathbb{E}_x[\, M_{t'}^r \,|\, \mathcal{F}_t^0\,] &= \mathbb{E}_x[\, P_{[0,r]\setminus[0,t']}\varphi(X_{t'}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_t^0\,] \\ &= P_{[0,t']\setminus[0,t]}\big(P_{[0,r]\setminus[0,t']}\varphi\big)(X_t) \\ &= P_{[0,r]\setminus[0,t]}\varphi(X_t) = M_t^r, \end{aligned}$$

using Chapman-Kolmogorov equation (2.2).

According to Theorem 2.3, the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N}$ is commuting. Then, as stated in [26] (and originally proved in [3]), since M^r is a bounded multiparameter martingale with respect to a commuting filtration, there exists an event $\Lambda_{\varphi,r} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $x \in E$, $\mathbb{P}_x(\Lambda_{\varphi,r}^c) = 0$ and for all $\omega \in \Lambda_{\varphi,r}$,

$$\lim_{s \downarrow t,\, s \in \mathbf{Q}_+^N} M_s^r(\omega) \text{ exists for all } t \prec r \in \mathbf{R}_+^N. \tag{3.1}$$

The event Λ is defined by

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}, r \in \mathbf{Q}_+^N} \Lambda_{\varphi,r}$$

and satisfies for all $x \in E$, $\mathbb{P}_x(\Lambda^c) = 0$

Let prove $\lim_{s \downarrow t,\, s \in \mathbf{Q}_+^N} X_s(\omega)$ exists for all $\omega \in \Lambda$. We proceed by contradiction. Hence, let suppose there exist $\omega \in \Lambda$, $t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and two decreasing sequences $(s_n^1)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}, (s_n^2)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ in $\mathbf{Q}_+^N$ such that $\lim_{n \in \mathbf{N}} s_n^1 = t$, $\lim_{n \in \mathbf{N}} s_n^2 = t$ and

$$X_t^1(\omega) := \lim_{s_n^1 \downarrow t} X_{s_n^1}(\omega) \neq \lim_{s_n^2 \downarrow t} X_{s_n^2}(\omega) := X_t^2(\omega),$$

where the limits stand in E_Δ.

Then, as functions in $\mathcal{H}$ separate points in E_Δ, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\varphi(X_t^1(\omega)) \neq \varphi(X_t^2(\omega))$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be $\varepsilon = |\varphi(X_t^1(\omega)) - \varphi(X_t^2(\omega))|$ and $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ be the decreasing sequence $u_n = (s_n^1 \curlyvee s_n^2) + \frac{1}{n} \in \mathbf{Q}_+^N$.

Since the transition system $\mathcal{P}$ of X is Feller, equation (2.16) implies there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\forall u \preceq v \preceq 2t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad \|u - v\|_\infty \leq \alpha \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \big\|P_{[0,v]\setminus[0,u]}\varphi - \varphi\big\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}.$$

Furthermore, since $u_n \to_n t$, there exists $k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq k$, $\|u_n - t\| \leq \alpha$, which implies that for any $n \geq k$, $\|u_k - s_n^1\| \leq \alpha$ and $\|u_k - s_n^2\| \leq \alpha$.

Therefore, for all $n \geq k$, we obtain

$$\big\|P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^1]}\varphi - \varphi\big\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^2]}\varphi - \varphi\big\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}.$$

Since $\omega \in \Lambda_{\varphi,u_k}$ and according to equation (3.1), k can be chosen large enough such that for all $n \geq k$, we have $|M_{s_n^1}^{u_k}(\omega) - M_{s_n^2}^{u_k}(\omega)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}$, i.e.

$$\forall n \geq k; \quad \big|P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^1]}\varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega)) - P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^2]}\varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega))\big| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}.$$

Finally, as the function φ is continuous, k can be supposed to satisfy

$$\forall n \geq k; \quad \left|\varphi(X_t^1(\omega)) - \varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega))\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\varphi(X_t^2(\omega)) - \varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega))\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}.$$

Using previous inequalities, we obtain for all $n \geq k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\varphi(X_t^1(\omega)) - \varphi(X_t^2(\omega))\right| &\leq \left|\varphi(X_t^1(\omega)) - \varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega))\right| \\ &\quad + \left|\varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega)) - P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^1]}\varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega))\right| \\ &\quad + \left|P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^1]}\varphi(X_{s_n^1}(\omega)) - P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^2]}\varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega))\right| \\ &\quad + \left|\varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega)) - P_{[0,u_k]\setminus[0,s_n^2]}\varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega))\right| \\ &\quad + \left|\varphi(X_t^2(\omega)) - \varphi(X_{s_n^2}(\omega))\right| \\ &\leq \frac{5}{8}\varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

which is in contradiction with the definition ε.

Therefore, for all $\omega \in \Lambda$ and $t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, $\lim_{s\downarrow t,\, s\in\mathbf{Q}_+^N} X_s(\omega)$ exists in E_Δ and the process $\widetilde{X}$ can be defined by

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad \widetilde{X}_t = \begin{cases} \lim_{s\downarrow t,\, s\in\mathbf{Q}_+^N} X_s(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \Lambda \\ x_0 & \text{if } \omega \notin \Lambda, \end{cases}$$

where x_0 is an arbitrary point in E. $\widetilde{X}$ is an E_Δ-valued process which is right-continuous.

Let now prove $\widetilde{X}$ is a modification of X. Let φ_1 and φ_2 be in $C_0(E)$. Then, for all $x \in E$ and $t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\varphi_1(\widetilde{X}_t)\varphi_2(X_t)\right] &= \lim_{s\downarrow t,\, s\in\mathbf{Q}_+^N} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\varphi_1(X_s)\varphi_2(X_t)\right] \\ &= \lim_{s\downarrow t,\, s\in\mathbf{Q}_+^N} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathbb{E}_x[\varphi_1(X_s)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_t]\,\varphi_2(X_t)\right] \\ &= \lim_{s\downarrow t,\, s\in\mathbf{Q}_+^N} \mathbb{E}_x\left[P_{[0,s]\setminus[0,t]}\varphi_1(X_t)\,\varphi_2(X_t)\right] = \mathbb{E}_x\left[\varphi_1(X_t)\varphi_2(X_t)\right],\end{aligned}$$

using the dominated convergence theorem and the Feller property. A classic monotone class argument extends this equality to any measurable function $f : E^2 \to \mathbf{R}_+$, and in particular, we obtain

$$\forall x \in E,\ \forall t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad \mathbb{P}_x(X_t = \widetilde{X}_t) = 1.$$

The process $\widetilde{X}$ is clearly adapted to the filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ and using Theorem 2.5, we get the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property with respect to the augmented filtration. □

We notice that the martingale argument used in the proof can not be directly transpose to the set-indexed formalism since there does not exist any result on set-indexed martingales (see [24]) which states the existence of a right-continuous modification.

3.2. $\mathcal{C}$-Markov and multiparameter Markov properties

A vast literature exists on multiparameter Markov properties, especially in the particular case of two-parameter processes. It includes works [31, 34, 11, 12] previously mentioned on Paul Lévy *sharp-Markov* and *germ-Markov* properties, but also literature on Gaussian Markov random fields [37, 29, 10] and strong Markov properties [15, 16, 27]. Different surveys and books [38, 13, 14, 23] have been written on these distinct topics. In the context of this article, we focus on two existing multiparameter properties which can be directly linked up to our work.

We begin with the $*$-*Markov* property which has been introduced in [8] in the context of two-parameter processes. A process $(X_{s,t})_{s,t}$ is said to be $*$-*Markov* if for all $s,t\in\mathbf{R}_+$, $h,k>0$ and $\Gamma\in\mathcal{E}$, X satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{s+h,t+k}\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_{s,t})=\mathbb{P}(X_{s+h,t+k}\in\Gamma\,|\,X_{s,t},X_{s+h,t},X_{s,t+k}),\tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{G}^*_{s,t}$ correspond to the strong history previously introduced. The $*$-Markov property has been widely studied and used in the literature, leading to several interesting results, including martingale characterization in the Gaussian case [36], equivalence of different definitions [28], properties on transition probabilities [32] and sample paths càdlàguity [46]. We note that the $*$-Markov property also appears in the study of two-parameter Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes [42, 45].

As stated in the following proposition, it turns out that $\mathcal{C}$-Markov and $*$-Markov properties are equivalent in the two-parameter setting.

Proposition 3.1. *In the context of two-parameters processes, which corresponds to $\mathcal{T}=\mathbf{R}^2_+$ and the indexing collection $\mathcal{A}=\{[0,t]\,;t\in\mathbf{R}^2_+\}$, the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov and $*$-Markov properties are equivalent.*

Proof. Let X be a two-parameter $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process. For any $s,t\in\mathbf{R}_+$, $h,k>0$ and $\Gamma\in\mathcal{E}$, we consider the increment $C=A\setminus B:=[0,(s+h,t+k)]\setminus\big([0,(s,t)]\cup[0,(s+h,t)]\cup[0,(s,t+k)]\big)$. Then, we clearly observe that $\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}}=(X_{s,t},X_{s+h,t},X_{s,t+k})$ and $\mathcal{G}^*_{s,t}=\mathcal{G}^*_C$. Therefore, the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property $\mathbb{P}(X_A\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathcal{G}^*_C)=\mathbb{P}(X_A\in\Gamma\,|\,\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{C}})$ induces equation (3.2).

Conversely, let X be a $*$-Markov process and $C=A\setminus B$ be an increment where $A=[0,(s,t)]$ and $B=\cup_{i=1}^n[0,(s_i,t_i)]$. Without any loss of generality, we can suppose that $s_1<s_2<\ldots<s_n$. Then, since we consider an extremal representation of B, it also satisfies $t_1>t_2>\ldots>t_n$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}_C}=\big\{[0,(s_1,t_1)]\,,[0,(s_1,t_2)]\,,[0,(s_2,t_2)]\,,\ldots,[0,(s_{n-1},t_n)]\,,[0,(s_n,t_n)]\big\}.$$

Then, it is consequence of Theorem 3.7 from [28] that X satisfies the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property on the increment C. $\square$

Proposition 3.1 clearly shows that the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property offers an elegant way to extend the two-parameter $*$-Markov property to multiparameter processes, and more largely, to set-indexed processes.

Furthermore, the set-indexed formalism allows to simplify notations and concepts compared to the $*$-Markov framework. Indeed, as stated in [32, 46], the concept of $*$-transition function (P^1,P^2,P) has been introduced to characterize the law of $*$-Markov process. The corresponding notion of $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ replaces the triplet (P^1, P^2, P), and reduces the different consistency hypotheses on (P^1, P^2, P) to the single Chapman-Kolmogorov equation (2.2). Finally, we also note that Theorem 3.1 extends the regularity result obtained in [46] for two-parameter processes.

A second interesting Markov property is the *multiparameter Markov* property that is considered in [26]. It has been widely studied in the literature (see e.g. [22, 33, 44]), in particular to obtain sample paths properties using the potential theory.

An E_Δ valued process $X = \{X_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$ is said to be a *multiparameter Markov* process if there exists a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ and a family of operators $\mathfrak{T} = \{\mathfrak{T}_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$ such that for all $x \in E$, there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_x$ which satisfies

(i) X is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$;

(ii) $t \mapsto X_t$ is right-continuous $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s. for all $x \in E$;

(iii) for all $t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, $\mathcal{F}_t$ is $\mathbb{P}_x$-complete for all $x \in E$; moreover, $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ is a commuting filtration with respect to all measures $\mathbb{P}_x$, $x \in E$ i.e. for all $s, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$ and for any bounded $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable random variable Y,
$$\mathbb{E}_x[\,Y \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\,] = \mathbb{E}_x[\,Y \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s\curlywedge t}\,] \quad \mathbb{P}_x\text{-a.s.}$$

(iv) for all $s, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, for all $f \in C_0(E)$ and for any $x \in E$,
$$\mathbb{E}_x[\,f(X_{t+s}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\,] = \mathfrak{T}_t f(X_s) \quad \mathbb{P}_x\text{-a.s.}$$

(v) for all $x \in E$, $\mathbb{P}_x(X_0 = x) = 1$.

Furthermore, X is said to be a *Feller* process if

(i) for all $t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$, $\mathfrak{T}_t : C_0(E) \to C_0(E)$;

(ii) for any $f \in C_0(E)$, $\lim_{t\to 0} \|\mathfrak{T}_t f - f\|_\infty = 0$.

In the following proposition, we observe that homogeneous $\mathcal{C}$-Feller processes are also *multiparameter Markov* processes.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an homogeneous and Feller $\mathcal{C}$-transition system, $(\mathbb{P}_x)_{x\in E}$ a family of probabilities and $\widetilde{X} = \{\widetilde{X}_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$ the* multiparameter $\mathcal{C}$-Markov process *constructed in Theorem 3.1, which is right-continuous $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s and satisfies $\mathbb{P}_x(\widetilde{X}_0 = x) = 1$ for all $x \in E$.*

Then, $\widetilde{X}$ is also a multiparameter Markov and Feller process *with respect to the filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$ and with the following transition operators $\mathfrak{T} = \{\mathfrak{T}_t; t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$,*
$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N,\ \forall f : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}_+ \text{ measurable}; \quad \mathfrak{T}_t f = P_{[0,t]\setminus\{0\}} f.$$

Proof. We have to check the different points of the previous definition of *multiparameter Markov processes*.

(i) $\widetilde{X}$ is clearly adapted to $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^N}$;

(ii) $\widetilde{X}$ is right-continuous $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s. according to Theorem 3.1;

(iii) $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\in\mathbf{R}_+^n}$ is a commuting filtration using Theorem 2.3;

(iv) for all $s, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N$ and for all $f \in C_0(E)$, we have $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x[\, f(\widetilde{X}_{t+s}) \,|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_s \,] &= P_{[0,t+s]\setminus[0,s]} f(\widetilde{X}_s) && \text{since } X \text{ is } \mathcal{C}\text{-Markov} \\ &= P_{[0,t]\setminus\{0\}} f(\widetilde{X}_s) && \text{since } \mathcal{P} \text{ is homogeneous} \\ &:= \mathcal{T}_t f(\widetilde{X}_s); \end{aligned}$$

(v) for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, the hypotheses state that $\mathbb{P}_x(\widetilde{X}_0 = x) = 1$.

Finally, the Feller hypotheses on $\mathcal{T}$ are easily verified using equation (2.16) and Definition 2.13 of a Feller $\mathcal{C}$-transition system. □

As stated in [26], the family of operators $\mathcal{T}$ characterizes the two-dimensional marginals of X, but it is not known if it determines entirely the law of X. Proposition 3.2 partially answers this question since when X is also $\mathcal{C}$-Markov, we know that the larger family $\mathcal{P}$ of transition probabilities completely characterizes the finite-dimensional distributions of X.

Since it is not known whether the multiparameter Markov property gives a complete picture of the law of a process X, it is not possible to obtain a general result which would state that multiparameter Markov processes are also $\mathcal{C}$-Markov. Nevertheless, we show in the following examples that classic multiparameter Markov processes considered in the literature are also $\mathcal{C}$-Markov.

Example 3.1 (Additive Lévy processes). An *additive Lévy process* $X = \{X_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N\}$ is defined by

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N; \quad X_t = X^1_{t_1} + \cdots + X^N_{t_N}.$$

where $X^1, \ldots, X^N$ are N independent one-parameter Lévy processes. As explained in [26], X is a multiparameter Markov process.

To check the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property, we observe that for any increment $C \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\Delta X_C = \Delta X^1_{C_1} + \cdots + \Delta X^N_{C_N},$$

where $C_i = C \cap e_i$ and $e_1 = \mathbf{R} \times \{0\}^{N-1}, \ldots, e_N$ correspond to the natural axis in $\mathbf{R}^N$. Therefore, X has independent increments and is $\mathcal{C}$-Markov. Furthermore, transitions probabilities have the following form, for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) = \left(\nu_1^{\lambda_1(C_1)} * \cdots * \nu_N^{\lambda_1(C_N)} \right)(\Gamma - \Delta x_B)$$

where $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, λ_1 denotes the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbf{R}$ and $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_N$ are the infinitely divisible probability measures which characterize $X^1, \ldots, X^N$. $\mathcal{P}$ is also an homogeneous Feller $\mathcal{C}$-transition system.

We remark that X is not necessarily a *set-indexed Lévy process* (as defined in Example 2.2), unless according to Theorem 4.3 in [20], there exists a measure ν and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N$ in $\mathbf{R}_+^*$ such that $\nu = \nu_1^{\alpha_1} = \cdots = \nu_N^{\alpha_N}$. In this specific case, for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we obtain $P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \Gamma) = \nu^{m_\alpha(C)}(\Gamma - \Delta x_B)$, where the measure m_α is defined by

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^N); \quad m_\alpha(A) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \lambda_1(e_i \cap A).$$

In particular, we note that the *additive Brownian motion* corresponds to a *set-indexed Brownian motion* based on the measure m_α with $\alpha = (1,\ldots,1)$.

Conversely, set-indexed Lévy processes are not necessarily additive and multiparameter Markov processes. The simplest illustration of that class of processes is the *Brownian sheet*, which corresponds to a *set-indexed Brownian motion* based on Lebesgue measure.

Example 3.2 (**Product processes**). Let consider m independent multiparameter Markov and $\mathcal{C}$-Markov processes $X^i = \{X^i_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}_+^{M_i}\}$, $\mathbf{R}^{d_i}$-valued. Then, the *product process* X is defined by

$$\forall t = t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_m \in \mathbf{R}_+^M; \quad X_t = X^1_{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes X^m_{t_m},$$

where $M = M_1 + \ldots + M_m$. X is known [26] to be a multiparameter Markov process. Let prove it is also $\mathcal{C}$-Markov.

We define the subsets $S_1,\ldots,S_m$ of $\mathbf{R}^M$ as following: $S_1 = \mathbf{R}^{d_1} \times \{0\}^{d_2} \times \cdots \times \{0\}^{d_m}$, $S_2 = \{0\}^{d_1} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_2} \times \{0\}^{d_3} \times \cdots \times \{0\}^{d_m}$, … Similarly to additive Lévy processes, we remark that for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\Delta X_C = \Delta X^1_{C_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Delta X^m_{C_m},$$

where C_i corresponds to $C \cap S_i$, for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$.

Therefore, using the independence, the study of an increment ΔX_C can be reduced to the study of coordinate processes $X^1,\ldots,X^m$. In particular, since these satisfy the $\mathcal{C}$-Markov property, so does X. Its $\mathcal{C}$-transition system $\mathcal{P}$ is given by, for all $C = A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A) = P^1_{C_1}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_1}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes P^m_{C_m}(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C_m}}; \mathrm{d}x_{A_m}), \tag{3.3}$$

where $P^i_{C_i}$ refers to the $\mathcal{C}$-transition probabilities of X^i. Furthermore, when the components $(X^i)_{i\leq m}$ are ($\mathcal{C}$-)Feller processes, X is also ($\mathcal{C}$-)Feller.

The *bi-Brownian motion* $Y = \{Y_t;\, t \in \mathbf{R}^2_+\}$ is a simple illustration of this class of processes:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}^2_+; \quad Y_t = B^1_{t_1} \otimes B^2_{t_2}$$

where B^1 and B^2 are two independent $\mathbf{R}^d$-valued Brownian motion. Equation (3.3) induces that the Markov kernel $\mathcal{P}$ is characterized by the following densities, for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$p_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; (u \otimes v)) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d(\lambda_1(C_1)\lambda_1(C_2))^{d/2}} \exp\biggl(-\frac{\|u - \Delta x^1_{B_1}\|^2}{2\lambda_1(C_1)} - \frac{\|v - \Delta x^2_{B_2}\|^2}{2\lambda_1(C_2)}\biggr).$$

Example 3.3 (**Multiparameter Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes**). As proved in [6], on the space $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}, m_\alpha)$, the *Gaussian set-indexed Ornstein-Uhlenbeck* process has the following integral representation:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}^N_+; \quad X_t = e^{-\langle \alpha, t\rangle}\biggl[X_0 + \sigma \int_{(-\infty,t]\setminus(-\infty,0]} e^{\langle \alpha, u\rangle} \mathrm{d}W_u\biggr].$$

where $\sigma > 0$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N) \in \mathbf{R}^N$ with $\alpha_i > 0$, W is the Brownian sheet and X_0 is a random variable independent of W.

A different, but also natural, multiparameter extension of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process has been suggested in the literature (e.g. see [42, 43] and [17]). It is defined by,

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}^N_+; \quad Y_t = e^{-\langle \alpha, t\rangle}\biggl[Y_0 + \sigma \int_{[0,t]} e^{\langle \alpha, u\rangle} \mathrm{d}W_u\biggr].$$

As shown in [43], Y is an $*$-Markov process in the two-parameter case. A calculus similar to Proposition 2.5 from [6] proves that it is also $\mathcal{C}$-Markov. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ respectively denote the $\mathcal{C}$-transition system of X and Y, we observe that

$$\widetilde{P}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A) = \begin{cases} \delta_{\Delta x_B}(\mathrm{d}x_A) & \text{for all } \ C \in \mathcal{C} \ \text{ s.t. } \ C \subseteq S; \\ P_C(\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{C}}; \mathrm{d}x_A) & \text{for all } \ C \in \mathcal{C} \ \text{ s.t. } \ C \cap S = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

where the set S corresponds to $\{t \in \mathbf{R}_+^N : \prod_{i=1}^N t_i = 0\}$.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank his supervisor Erick Herbin for his useful comments which have helped to greatly improve this paper.

References

[1] R. J. Adler. *The geometry of random fields*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1981. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

[2] R. J. Adler and P. D. Feigin. On the cadlaguity of random measures. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(2): 615–630, 1984.

[3] D. Bakry. Sur la régularité des trajectoires des martingales à deux indices. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 50(2):149–157, 1979.

[4] R. M. Balan. *Q*-Markov random probability measures and their posterior distributions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 109(2):295–316, 2004.

[5] R. M. Balan and G. Ivanoff. A Markov property for set-indexed processes. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 15(3):553–588, 2002.

[6] P. Balança and E. Herbin. A set-indexed Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. *Preprint*, 2012. `arXiv:1203.5524`.

[7] R. F. Bass and R. Pyke. The existence of set-indexed Lévy processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 66(2):157–172, 1984.

[8] R. Cairoli. Une classe de processus de Markov. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 273: A1071–A1074, 1971.

[9] R. Cairoli and J. B. Walsh. Stochastic integrals in the plane. *Acta Math.*, 134:111–183, 1975.

[10] É. Carnal and J. B. Walsh. Markov properties for certain random fields. In *Stochastic analysis*, pages 91–110. Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1991.

[11] R. C. Dalang and J. B. Walsh. The sharp Markov property of the Brownian sheet and related processes. *Acta Math.*, 168(3-4):153–218, 1992.

[12] R. C. Dalang and J. B. Walsh. The sharp Markov property of Lévy sheets. *Ann. Probab.*, 20(2):591–626, 1992.

[13] M. Dozzi. *Stochastic processes with a multidimensional parameter*, volume 194 of *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series*. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1989.

[14] M. Dozzi. Two-parameter stochastic processes. In *Stochastic processes and related topics (Georgenthal, 1990)*, volume 61 of *Math. Res.*, pages 17–43. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.

[15] I. V. Evstigneev. Extremal problems and the strong Markov property of random fields. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 37(5(227)):183–184, 1982.

[16] I. V. Evstigneev. Stochastic extremal problems and the strong Markov property of random fields. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 43(2(260)):3–41, 230, 1988.

[17] S.-E. Graversen and J. Pedersen. Representations of Urbanik's classes and multiparameter Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 16:200–212, 2011.

[18] E. Herbin and E. Merzbach. A set-indexed fractional Brownian motion. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 19(2):337–364, 2006.

[19] E. Herbin and E. Merzbach. Stationarity and self-similarity characterization of the set-indexed fractional Brownian motion. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 22(4):1010–1029, 2009.

[20] E. Herbin and E. Merzbach. The set-indexed Lévy process: Stationarity, Markov and sample paths properties. *Preprint*, 2012. `arXiv:1108.0873`.

[21] E. Herbin and A. Richard. Local Hölder regularity for set-indexed processes. *Preprint*, 2012. `arXiv:1203.0750`.

[22] F. Hirsch and S. Song. Markov properties of multiparameter processes and capacities. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 103(1):45–71, 1995.

[23] P. Imkeller. *Two-parameter martingales and their quadratic variation*, volume 1308 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.

[24] G. Ivanoff and E. Merzbach. *Set-indexed martingales*, volume 85 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2000.

[25] G. Ivanoff and E. Merzbach. Set-indexed Markov processes. In *Stochastic models (Ottawa, ON, 1998)*, volume 26 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 217–232. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.

[26] D. Khoshnevisan. *Multiparameter processes: An Introduction to Random Fields*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[27] K. K. J. Kinateder. Strong Markov properties for Markov random fields. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 13(4):1101–1114, 2000.

[28] H. Korezlioglu, P. Lefort, and G. Mazziotto. Une propriété markovienne et diffusions associées. In *Two-index random processes (Paris, 1980)*, volume 863 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 245–274. Springer, Berlin, 1981.

[29] H. Künsch. Gaussian Markov random fields. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 26 (1):53–73, 1979.

[30] P. Lévy. Sur le mouvement brownien dépendant de plusieurs paramètres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 220:420–422, 1945.

[31] P. Lévy. *Processus Stochastiques et Mouvement Brownien. Suivi d'une note de M. Loève.* Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1948.

[32] S. J. Luo. Two-parameter homogeneous Markovian process. *Acta Math. Sci. (English Ed.)*, 8(3):315–322, 1988.

[33] G. Mazziotto. Two-parameter Hunt processes and a potential theory. *Ann. Probab.*, 16(2): 600–619, 1988.

[34] H. P. McKean. Brownian motion with a several-dimensional time. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.*, 8:357–378, 1963.

[35] D. Nualart. Two-parameter diffusion processes and martingales. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 15(1):31–57, 1983.

[36] D. Nualart and M. Sanz. A Markov property for two-parameter Gaussian processes. *Stochastica*, 3(1):1–16, 1979.

[37] L. D. Pitt. A Markov property for Gaussian processes with a multidimensional parameter. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 43:367–391, 1971.

[38] Y. A. Rozanov. *Markov random fields*. Applications of Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982. Translated from the Russian by Constance M. Elson.

[39] F. Russo. Étude de la propriété de Markov étroite en relation avec les processus planaires à accroissements indépendants. In *Seminar on probability, XVIII*, volume 1059 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 353–378. Springer, Berlin, 1984.

[40] G. Samorodnitsky and M. S. Taqqu. *Stable non-Gaussian random processes*. Stochastic Modeling. Chapman & Hall, New York, 1994. Stochastic models with infinite variance.

[41] J. B. Walsh. Martingales with a multidimensional parameter and stochastic integrals in the plane. In *Lectures in probability and statistics (Santiago de Chile, 1986)*, volume 1215 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 329–491. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

[42] Z. Wang. Transition probabilities and prediction for two-parameter Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Kexue Tongbao (English Ed.)*, 33(1):5–9, 1988.

[43] Z. Wang. Multi-parameter Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. In *Dirichlet forms and stochastic processes (Beijing, 1993)*, pages 375–382. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1995.

[44] E. Wong. Multiparameter martingale and Markov process. In *Stochastic differential systems (Bad Honnef, 1988)*, volume 126 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pages 329–336. Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[45] R. C. Zhang. Markov properties of the generalized Brownian sheet and extended OUP_2. *Sci. Sinica Ser. A*, 28(8):814–825, 1985.

[46] X. W. Zhou and J. W. Zhou. Sample function properties of two-parameter Markov processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 47(1):37–51, 1993.